

AND



ANNA REINIKKA | ARS PSEUDO-SCAURI: A CRITICAL EDITION AND COMMENTARY

ARS PSEUDO-SCAURI A CRITICAL EDITION AND COMMENTARY

ANNA REINIKKA

ISBN 978-952-10-8553-6
UNIGRAFIA
HELSINKI 2012

Ars Pseudo-Scauri:

A Critical Edition and Commentary

Anna Reinikka

Academic dissertation

To be publicly discussed, by due permission of the Faculty of Arts
at the University of Helsinki in auditorium XII, on the
15th of February, 2013 at 12 o'clock.

© Anna Reinikka 2012

ISBN 978-952-10-8553-6 (paperback)

Unigrafia, Helsinki 2012

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor, Docent Anneli Luhtala, for her patience and guidance during all the stages of this project: I am grateful to her for originally suggesting this topic of research to me and for the excellent supervision she has provided during these past many years. In addition to my personal gratitude, also my academic indebtedness to her is great, as can be gleaned from the bibliography. My gratitude is also due to the late Dr. Vivien Law, who first discovered the text which is the object of this study, and whose research on Late Antique and Medieval grammar has greatly furthered this project, among many others.

I would also like to thank the pre-examiners of this work, Professor Mario De Nonno and Dr. Jaana Vaahtera, for carefully reading my thesis and for their many helpful comments, which certainly improved the final version of the thesis. Needless to say, any mistakes that remain are my responsibility.

I am deeply grateful for the funding that made my research possible: the Finnish Cultural Foundation, the Academy of Finland, and the University of Helsinki all provided financial support in the various stages of my project.

My family and friends have always been very supportive of my work, even if the lure of texts and manuscripts from times long past sometimes eludes them. I owe special gratitude to my husband Jarno Talponen, who knows the ups and downs of this kind of work, and who never fails in his support and love. Our two cats, Harmi and Rontti, who consider the stacks of books in my study their personal playthings, also deserve my thanks for distracting me from my work when I have most needed it.

Helsinki, December 2012

A.R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Introduction | |
| 1.1 The Discovery of the <i>Ars Pseudo-Scauri</i> and its Transmission | 1 |
| 1.2 The Attribution of the <i>Ars Pseudo-Scauri</i> | 7 |
| 1.3 The Structure of the <i>Ars Pseudo-Scauri</i> and its Dating | 17 |
| 1.4 The Sources of <i>Ars Pseudo-Scauri</i> and its Reception | 28 |
| 1.5 Notes on the Edition | 41 |
| 2. Critical Edition of the <i>Ars Pseudo-Scauri</i> | 44 |
| 3. Commentary | |
| 3.1. <i>De arte</i> | 70 |
| 3.2 <i>De uoce</i> | 77 |
| 3.3 <i>De litteris</i> | 83 |
| 3.4 <i>De syllabis</i> | 90 |
| 3.5 <i>De dictione, de locutione, de definitione, de oratione</i> | 101 |
| 3.6 <i>De nomine</i> | 106 |
| 3.7 <i>De pronomine</i> | 144 |
| 3.8 <i>De uerbo</i> | 153 |
| 3.9 <i>De participio</i> | 175 |
| 3. 10 <i>De aduerbio</i> | 184 |
| 3. 11 <i>De praepositione</i> | 189 |
| 3. 12 <i>De coniunctione</i> | 194 |
| 3. 13 <i>De interiectione</i> | 200 |
| 4. Conclusions | 204 |
| 5. Bibliography | 209 |
| Appendix – A Translation of the <i>Ars Pseudo-Scauri</i> | |

1.1 The Discovery of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* and its Transmission

In 1987, an article by Dr. Vivien Law announced one of the most significant textual discoveries in the field of ancient linguistics in modern times. This article, “An Unnoticed Late Latin Grammar: The *Ars minor* of Scaurus?”, revealed the finding of what the author considered to be the *Ars minor* of Q. Terentius Scaurus,¹ a second century AD grammarian. It is hard to believe that such a text had escaped the notice of text-hunters and scholars for centuries since the Renaissance.² Since the text happens to be preserved in a manuscript (Clm 6281), that was used on several occasions by Heinrich Keil in preparing his editions for the *Grammatici Latini* series, such an oversight seems all the more incredible.³ Moreover, we are dealing with a text spanning ten folios, not a textual fragment of a mere few lines.

Part of the explanation to this puzzle, as Law points out in her article (1987: 68–69), lies in the fact that the text has no title or *explicit*. It follows the previous text, a part of the *Explanationes in artem Donati*, without interruption.⁴ Since all the other treatises included in this grammatical miscellany have either a title, an *explicit*, or both, it would seem that the grammar in question, the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri*,⁵ was considered to belong to the previous text, the *Explanationes in artem Donati*, by the scribe who copied this part of the manuscript.

A description of this manuscript by Keil, appearing in volume four of his *Grammatici Latini*, is also to blame for this lapse.⁶ Keil gives the following description for the section of Clm 6281 with which we are concerned: “f. 27 *Incipit expositum sergii de octo partibus orationis. Oratio dicitur* – f. 52 *proferuntur*: Sergii explanationes in Donatum 487, 22–518, 29. | f. 52 *De littera. Littera dicta est* – f. 62* *de interiectione et siqua sunt similia: excerpta ex Donati arte maiore et Sergii in eam explanationibus*” (*GL* 4: xliv, note). In this “uncharacteristically inaccurate” (Law

¹ For a discussion on the attribution of this text to Q. Terentius Scaurus, see chapter 1.2 below.

² The existence of this text did not escape everyone’s notice completely, as Law notes in her article: “One modern reader of the manuscript did recognise this text as an independent work: on f. 52r, in the margin opposite the heading DE UOCE, is a note ‘videtur esse auct. anon. Comment. in Donati ed. scdam.’, and a further note on f. 61r compares the definition of the adverb found there to Donatus’s (via a page reference to Putsch)” (1987: 70 n. 9).

³ According to Law (1987: 68 n. 3), “Keil used this manuscript for editions of the following texts: pseudo-Augustine, *Regulae*; pseudo-Sergius, *Explanationes in Donatum I*; Servius, *De finalibus*; Sergius, *De littera*; Maximus Victorinus, *De ratione metrorum*; Phocas, *Ars de nomine et verbo*.”

⁴ Only the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* and a short excerpt from the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville (ff. 87v–88r) receive no title or *explicit* of their own; even a short *tract* on inflection (ff. 108v–114v) begins with a title of its own: “*INC(I)P(IU)NT DECL(INATIO)N(E)S NOMINUM*”.

⁵ The grammar will be referred to in this study as the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* or the *APS*.

⁶ See also Law’s discussion (1987: 69–70) on this issue.

1987: 69) description, Keil refers to a sequence actually appearing on f. 49v⁷ as appearing on f. 52r instead. The section of the *Explanations* preserved in Clm 6281, according to Keil, namely GL 4: 487, 22–518, 29, comes to an end on f. 49v. The folios 49v–52r contain, however, yet another chapter of the *Explanations* (GL 4: 518, 31–522, 12) disguised by the omission of some of the longer literary quotations (Law 1987: 69). Thus the *Explanations* of Ps.-Sergius concludes only on f. 52r with the words “... uocalis est” and is followed by a new chapter heading, *DE ARTE*. What follows this chapter heading, on ff. 52r–62v, is not, as Keil describes it, “*excerpta ex Donati arte maiore et Sergii in eam explanationibus*”,⁸ but an independent grammatical text, apparently transmitted in its entirety.⁹

The description of Clm 6281 by Keil was the basis for the description by G. Thomas, which appeared in the *Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis* in 1873 (Law 1987: 69 n. 5). Similarly, later descriptions of the manuscript, by Bischoff (1940: 117), Jeudy (1972: 107ff.; 1974: 107ff.), Passalacqua (1978: 173–174), and Bierbrauer (1990: 38), only refer to the *Explanations* of Ps.-Sergius as regards the content of folios 27v–62v. Only the most recent catalogue, by G. Glauche, takes into account the 1987 article by Law and reads: “(52r–62v) Q. Terentius Scaurus (?): Ars minor. ›De arte‹ *Ars est uniuscuiusque rei scientia usu uel traditione ... - ... Ita pro dolor et pro pudor (pudor!) cum dicimus et si qua sunt similia*” (2000: 139).

In the light of the incomplete catalogues and other deficient descriptions of the manuscript in question, Law’s discovery of the *APS* seems almost serendipitous. But Law’s ample acquaintance with this particular manuscript played a significant part in the finding; already her fellowship dissertation in 1976 had focused on the *Declinationes nominum* treatise transmitted in Clm 6281 (ff. 108v–114v).¹⁰ Without her wide knowledge of Late Antique and Medieval grammatical texts, however, the significance of her finding might well have gone unrecognized.

Only one manuscript, Clm 6281, is of use in preparing the edition of the *APS*. The only other manuscript known to contain this text is Clm 18181, an apograph of Clm 6281, dating from the middle of the eleventh century.¹¹ The manuscript Clm 6281, now residing in Munich in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, consists of 126 folios of parchment bound mostly in quires forming

⁷ On f. 49v, the following sequence appears: “*hae interiectiones sunt quotiens cum exclamatione ab irato proferuntur. DE LITTERA Littera dicta est...*”.

⁸ “Excerpts from the *Ars maior* of Donatus expounded by Sergius”.

⁹ For a discussion on the structure of the *APS*, see chapter 1.3, below.

¹⁰ Cf. Law 1982: 56 n. 12. In the same volume, see also the discussion on certain *Declinationes nominum* treatises (1982: 56ff.) and the *Ars Asporii* (1982: 35ff.), where Clm 6281 is mentioned as well.

¹¹ This fact is acknowledged in the catalogues describing Clm 6281 (see, e.g., Glauche 2000: 138). For Clm 18181, see also Eder (1972: 87). As a direct copy of Clm 6281, Clm 18181 offers no new information and thus is not described in detail in this study. For a similar view, see also Law (1987: 68 n. 4).

eight leaves, except for the folios 1–7, 32–34, 59–62, 95–98, and 123–126 (Bierbrauer 1990: 38). The folios of Clm 6281 measure approximately 29 by 19 centimeters, with a writing area of 21–22,5 by 12,5–14 centimeters and 27–29 lines per page (Glauche 2000: 138). Clm 6281 was copied in the Freising scriptorium, probably during the reign of the bishop Erchanbert¹² (Bischoff 1940: 67, 117). The main bulk of the text is in Caroline minuscule with titles in monumental capitals, uncial script, or rustic capitals (Bierbrauer 1990: 38). Seven different hands of what Bischoff calls the later Hitto-Erchanbert group can be distinguished in Clm 6281 (1940: 117). According to Bischoff (1940: 67, 117), the exemplar of Clm 6281 was most likely of Insular origin. Law, on the other hand, while discussing the transmission of the *Ars Asporii* (GL 8: 39–61) preserved in that same manuscript (1982: 38, 38 n. 45), suggests that the Insular symptoms can be accounted for by the origin of Clm 6281 in the area of the Anglo-Saxon mission.

The extant binding, also originating in Freising, dates from the tenth or eleventh century (Glauche 2000: 138). The manuscript was present in Freising at the end of the twelfth century, when almost all the manuscripts of the cathedral library were furnished with a mark of ownership, which in Clm 6281 can be found on f. 1r (Glauche 2000: xiv, 138).¹³ Later, in the fifteenth century, a label bearing the number M 9 was affixed on the front cover, and, again, in the seventeenth century, another label containing information on the shelf-mark (CF 20) was attached to the spine of the manuscript.¹⁴ Finally, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, after the secularization of the ecclesiastical states in Germany and the resultant dissolution of numerous monasteries, abbeys, and other Catholic institutions, Clm 6281, along with 224 other manuscripts from Freising, came to be a part of the manuscript collection of what is today known as the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Glauche 2000: vii).

With only two extant manuscripts, one of which gives us no new information, the drawing of a *stemma codicum* is not useful. The fact that only one branch of the transmission of the *APS* exists in its entirety today leaves us in the dark about a number of things. In having to rely on a single manuscript we do not have the opportunity to gain information on the archetype or the chance to restore many of the corrupt or lost passages. On the basis of some readings in Clm 6281 that seem to betray confusions most likely to take place in an uncial script,¹⁵ as well as some most likely to be

¹² Erchanbert was bishop of Freising from 836 to 854.

¹³ “*Iste liber est sanctę Marię et s. Corbiniani Fris[in]g.*”

¹⁴ Similar labels can be found also in the other manuscripts from Freising (Glauche 2000: xiv, 138).

¹⁵ Such as the confusion between the letters *f* and *p*, or *p* and *r*, for instance (West 1973: 25–26). See, e.g., IV, 7 and XI, 42.

caused by forms of minuscule script,¹⁶ the exemplar of Clm 6281 was most likely written in a minuscule script, but at an earlier stage there probably existed an exemplar in an uncial script.

In addition to the readings transmitted in Clm 6281, the only other material relevant in establishing the text of the *APS* is provided by the passages of that text quoted in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius. These passages can offer us some assistance, as almost 30 percent of the *APS*¹⁷ has a parallel in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius. When these parallel passages are compared, we can see that they are not always identical. With the help of the *Explanationes*, I have been able to restore some lost passages to the edited text of the *APS*,¹⁸ but in some instances emendations could be suggested to the text of the *Explanationes*, based on the readings preserved in the manuscript transmitting the *APS*, Clm 6281.¹⁹ Clm 6281 and the manuscript used by the compiler of the *Explanationes* might thus belong to a different branch of the transmission of the *APS*. However, a number of shared errors²⁰ indicates that the two manuscripts belong to the same line of transmission, with the manuscript used by the compiler of the *Explanationes* in a higher position and thus exhibiting fewer mistakes.

The situation is, however, complicated by the fact that we cannot be sure that all the differences between the readings preserved in Clm 6281 and those appearing in the *Explanationes* are due to accidents of transmission. Because of their nature, grammatical texts were not assigned the same sacrosanct status as literary works; thus they could and would be modified by later users (West 1973: 16–17). While the passages of the *APS* preserved in the *Explanationes* could be treated as just another (although only partial) witness for the *APS*, we cannot be certain that they always reflect the intentions of the author of the *APS*.²¹ The compiler of the *Explanationes* used several different grammatical texts to compose a grammatical work of his own. To that end, he may easily have cut out material deemed superfluous or reorganized material from his sources according to his needs. Although at times the compiler of the *Explanationes* seems relatively conscientious in

¹⁶ These mistakes include, among others, the confusion between the letters *c* and *t* (West 1973: 25–26). See, e.g., IV, 23.

¹⁷ This estimate is only a rough calculation.

¹⁸ These instances are discussed in detail in the relevant passages in section 3.

¹⁹ Cf., e.g., chapter 3.6, p. 132 (*equorum distractione/ equo*). See also chapter 3.13, p. 202 n. 16.

²⁰ Cf., e.g., the definition of *uox* (II, 3) or the reading *rem* at XIV, 22.

²¹ Similar problems are highlighted in an article by De Paolis (1992: 63–71) concerning the *De verborum Graeci et Latini differentiis vel societatibus*, a text transmitted as *excerpta*: “Le considerazioni svolte a proposito del caso fortunato del *De diff.* ... mostrano l’importanza di determinare in primo luogo *chi* ha realizzato un *excerptum* e *perché*. In altre parole dobbiamo partire dal presupposto che chi compila un *excerptum* è mosso da un interesse ben diverso da quello di chi trascrive un testo; questo interesse sarà così la causa, e al tempo stesso la spiegazione, del tipo di intervento che l’*excerptor* opererà sul testo completo. Diviene così essenziale spiegarsi *come* l’*excerptor* ha lavorato: in assenza di riscontri obiettivi ... la ricostruzione del metodo dell’*excerptor* è l’unico strumento che può fornire qualche indizio sulla sua personalità e sui suoi fini” (De Paolis 1992: 70).

quoting the *APS*,²² on occasion, he seems to have reworked the *APS* to better suit his needs.²³ Both accidents of textual transmission and editorial interventions have to be taken into account when drawing on the passages of the *APS* preserved in the *Explanationes*. At times, this lessens their value as a witness to the text of the *APS*, and thus the material preserved in the *Explanationes* has not been considered on par with Clm 6281 in preparing this edition and has been taken into account only when the manuscript omits something completely or clearly offers an inferior reading.

The problems concerning the appraisal of the passages of the *APS* transmitted as part of the *Explanationes* are exacerbated by Keil's somewhat flawed edition of that text (*GL* 4: 486–565).²⁴ Keil based his edition mostly on one manuscript, St. Paul im Lavanttal, *Stiftsbibliothek* 2 I, which contains a sequence of texts that he judged to belong to a single work.²⁵ Keil's edition was the *editio princeps* for book 2 of the *Explanationes in artem Donati*, although, for some reason, he chose to leave much of the section covering the *vitia et virtutes orationis* out of his edition (*GL* 4: 562, note).²⁶ In addition to the choice of manuscripts and the decision to omit parts of the text, other aspects of Keil's edition are also problematic: the attribution of the work to Sergius (presumably to avoid confusion with Servius),²⁷ the attribution of two different works (book 1 and book 2) to a single author, and the division of the text into two books at *GL* 4: 534, 13 (De Paolis 2000: 174–175, 191). Later scholars, such as Jeep (1893: 35–40), have pointed out some of the discrepancies and contradictions between the two books of the *Explanationes* and argued for the existence of two different authors for the two parts.²⁸ According to De Paolis, this theory is also supported by the manuscript tradition of the *Explanationes*, which includes only two manuscripts (see n. 25)

²² Cf., e.g., XIV, 5–24 of the *APS* and the passages *GL* 4: 561, 20–25 and 562, 1–16 of the *Explanationes*.

²³ Cf., e.g., the transposition of *uox inarticulata* and *uox articulata* (II, 3–6).

²⁴ See the discussion in the article by De Paolis (2000: 173–200).

²⁵ In addition to St. Paul im Lavanttal, *Stiftsbibliothek* 2 I, the only other manuscript containing both book 1 and 2 of the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius is Oxford, *Magdalene College* 64, of Italian origin, dating from the first half of the fifteenth century. Keil did not use this manuscript for his edition, except for the passage *De accentibus* (*GL* 4: 524, 18–533, 27) (*GL* 4: 1–li). Furthermore, some excerpts from book 2 are preserved in Angers, *Bibliothèque Municipale* 493 (De Paolis 2000: 180).

²⁶ Parts of book 1 (*GL* 4: 487, 22–518, 29), covering the material appearing in the *Ars minor*, had already been published by F. Lindemann (Lipsiae 1820), who based his edition on Berlin, *Staatsbibliothek* Diez. B Sant 66. The preface to book 1, the opening part of the commentary, and the chapter *De accentibus* (*GL* 4: 486, 4–487, 21+487, 22–488, 7+524, 18–533, 27) had been published by I. ab Eichenfeld and S. Endlicher (Vindobonae 1837), who based their edition on St. Paul im Lavanttal *Stiftsbibliothek* 2 I (De Paolis 2000: 173–174). Keil included only the chapter *De soloecismo* (*GL* 4: 563, 1–564, 25) in his edition, with only a few indications of the content of the rest of the chapters on stylistics on p. 562, 564–565. These chapters were later edited by U. Schindel (Schindel 1975).

²⁷ See Keil's own discussion on the issue of the attribution (*GL* 4: lii–lv). Regarding this subject see also Law (1982: 17–19) and Kaster (1988: 356ff., 429ff.).

²⁸ See the discussion in the article by De Paolis (2000: 174–176). Other scholars who have accepted Jeep's argument for two authors for the two books include P. Wessner (1923: 1846), U. Schindel (1975: 35), and L. Holtz (1981: 234). Jeep (1893: 37) suggested that the first book referred to on many occasions in the second book is actually the text published by H. Hagen (*GL* 8: 143–158). De Paolis (2000: 196) thinks that it is more probable that the references in the second book of the *Explanationes* refer to the first book of the *Explanationes* but that the two books have a different author.

containing both books (2000: 176ff.). Most of the other manuscripts only contain book 1 of Keil's *Explanationes* (or parts of it), often without the preface (De Paolis 2000: 180–190).²⁹ Citing both the manuscript tradition and the internal evidence, De Paolis criticizes Keil's decision to divide the work into two books at *GL* 4: 534, 13, instead of dividing it at *GL* 4: 518, 29, after the first discussion on the parts of speech (2000: 194ff.). This division would produce two grammatical works, corresponding to the *Ars minor* and the *Ars maior* respectively (De Paolis 2000: 194–195).

That division clearly has its merits, but, as regards the *APS*, the situation becomes rather complicated. In her article, Vivien Law pointed out the fact that the grammar preserved in Clm 6281 was only quoted in the second book of the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 534, 15–565) and the preface to the first book (*GL* 4: 486–487, 21), a fact that led her to consider the possibility that that preface was originally meant to accompany book 2 instead (1987: 71 n. 12). De Paolis rejects this hypothesis, basing his view on the manuscript tradition, which nowhere preserves the preface of the first book (*GL* 4: 486, 4–487, 21) immediately preceding book 2, and the fact that in the preface a reference is made to the *Ars minor*, not the *Ars maior* (2000: 197, 200).³⁰ I find it implausible, however, that a text with so limited a circulation as the *APS*³¹ would have been available to two authors as widely removed in time as De Paolis believes them to be.³² As De Paolis suggests, the author of book 2 (whether or not it included also *GL* 4: 518, 30–534, 12) knew book 1, the commentary on the *Ars minor*, and continued upon it (2000: 196).³³ Could not this second author have written also the preface to the composite work (containing commentaries on both the *Ars minor* and the *Ars maior*)? This would explain the position of the preface as well as the reference to the *Ars minor*. In my view, De Paolis does not give this option serious consideration in his article.

Due to the state of the edition of the *Explanationes*, a collation of the manuscripts preserving the preface and the second book of the *Explanationes* must be made before the final version of the edition of the *APS* is published in order to examine such manuscript readings not included in Keil's edition.³⁴ A new edition of the *Explanationes* (or the two texts published as the *Expl.*) would also help shed more light on, for instance, the context or contexts in which the *APS* was later utilized.

²⁹ In many of these MSS, only what concerns the *Ars minor* in the first book of the *Expl.* is preserved, and the preface and the section *GL* 4: 518, 30–534, 12 are omitted; the chapter on *littera* may sometimes be preserved separately in a different part of the manuscript (De Paolis 2000: 185, 189).

³⁰ Cf. *GL* 4: 486, 5–6: “*hic vero huius artis peritus ab ipsis partibus orationis docendi sumpsit exordium, ...*”.

³¹ For views on the later use of the *APS* in other grammatical works see the discussion at the end of chapter 1.4.

³² De Paolis gives a dating between Servius and mid-sixth century for the first part of the text, and of the second part he says the following: “collocato in un'epoca piuttosto tarda (... più altomedievale che tardoantica)” (2000: 198, 218).

³³ See also the opinion of Wessner (1923: 1847): “Es ist wohl möglich, daß auch dies und jenes in der *Explan.* I vom Verfasser der zweiten Teiles herrührt, der jene durch seine Arbeit vervollständigen und ergänzen wollte.”

³⁴ I have not had an opportunity to do this to date.

1.2 The Attribution of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri*

The surviving manuscript evidence does not give any title, *explicit*, or other compelling information as to the name or the author of the grammatical text referred to in this study as the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* (*APS*). Dr. Vivien Law, who discovered the text, attributed it to the second century AD grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus (1987: 67–89). This attribution did not receive much attention among scholars and was not contested. Undoubtedly, the silence on the matter owed much to the fact that an edition by Law was expected to discuss the matter further and to corroborate the attribution.³⁵ The only study discussing Law’s attribution in any detail appeared in 2008, when, after beginning my work on the present edition, I challenged the attribution in my article.³⁶ In this chapter, I will review the material attributed to Q. Terentius Scaurus in the ancient sources and the views scholars hold as to its authenticity. Naturally, the attribution to Q. Terentius Scaurus of this grammatical text will be analyzed, as well as the evidence Law gathered to support it. Finally, arguments already presented in my 2008 article, along with some previously unpublished ones, will be gathered to promote the view that the *APS* is indeed a pseudepigraphic work.

Already in the nineteenth century, several scholars analyzed the material attributed by other grammarians to Q. Terentius Scaurus in the hope of gleaning information about the oeuvre of the distinguished grammarian of the age of Hadrian.³⁷ In his 1922 monograph *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars grammatica*, Karl Barwick was critical of some of these endeavours and argued for the existence of two grammarians referred to as Scaurus: the renowned grammarian of the earlier part of the second century AD³⁸ and another grammarian belonging to a later period.³⁹ In

³⁵ P. L. Schmidt (1989: 108) prefers the second of Law’s hypotheses; he considers the text a later epitome of Q. Terentius Scaurus’ work: “So ist jüngst eine Kurzfassung der Lehre des Terentius Scaurus (§ 433) entdeckt worden, auf die sich Zitierungen in den *Explanaciones in Donatum* (§ 702) beziehen. ... Ob sie wirklich die *Ars minor* des Scaurus selbst ist, wie die Entdeckerin will, oder nicht doch ein frühes spätantikes ‘Breviarium de breviario’ darstellt, wird sich ... erst nach der kommentierten Publikation des neuen Textes entscheiden lassen.” It is noteworthy that the *APS* is not listed under the oeuvre of Q. Terentius Scaurus (2nd cent. AD) but rather appears in volume 5 of the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* (*Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*).

³⁶ Reinikka 2008: 147–157.

³⁷ See the monographs by Kummrow (1880) and Meyer (1885).

³⁸ The editor of the *De orthographia* of Q. Terentius Scaurus, F. Biddau, puts the date of Scaurus’ death at around 138AD (Biddau 2008: xxxviii).

³⁹ Barwick (1922: 86–87): “Der Verfasser der expl. in Don. zitiert nämlich öfters einen gewissen Scaurus, den man bisher ohne Bedenken mit dem berühmten Grammatiker der hadrianischen Zeit identifiziert hat. ... Dieser Scaurus hat natürlich nichts zu tun mit dem berühmten älteren Grammatiker. Es muß, wenn kein Irrtum der Überlieferung vorliegt, einen jüngeren Grammatiker dieses Namens gegeben haben.” In his monograph, Barwick is critical of Kummrow’s work (1922: 238 n. 1). Della Casa (1985: 96) also considers the possibility that there existed two grammarians named Scaurus.

1977, Anna Maria Tempesti argued in her article for the existence of a later Pseudo-Scaurus, to whom she ascribed some of the views attributed to Scaurus in the Latin grammatical writings.⁴⁰

The biographical information on Q. Terentius Scaurus is based on relatively few references in grammatical works as well as some other texts.⁴¹ A chapter in Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* gives us an idea of the scope of the pursuits of Q. Terentius Scaurus and the milieu in which he worked: "*Terentius autem Scaurus, divi Hadriani temporibus grammaticus vel nobilissimus, inter alia, quae de Caeselli erroribus composuit, ...*" (11.15).⁴² A brief mention in the work of Julius Capitolinus also connects Scaurus with the age of the emperor Hadrian.⁴³ Two passages in Charisius (263, 11–12B; 272, 27–28B) as well as some of the manuscripts of the *De orthographia* give his name in full, Q. Terentius Scaurus.⁴⁴

From the passages in Julius Capitolinus and Aulus Gellius⁴⁵ we cannot find out exactly what the writings of Q. Terentius Scaurus consisted of, but the few instances in Charisius' grammar, which appear in sections taken over from the writings of Julius Romanus (Tempesti 1977: 184), shed more light on his oeuvre. Two quotations in Charisius' grammar make reference to an *ars grammatica* by Q. Terentius Scaurus, most likely spanning several books.⁴⁶ Other references to Scaurus in the grammar of Charisius suggest that he was also the author of a commentary on the works of Horace.⁴⁷ Another allusion to Scaurus found in the early third century AD commentary on Horace by Pomponius Porphyrio seems to corroborate this idea.⁴⁸

⁴⁰ Tempesti (1977: 175): "E importa rilevare subito che va distinta la produzione dello Scauro di epoca adrianea da quella di un grammatico più tardo, attribuita a lui dalla tradizione e dalla critica moderna, e che, invece, va assegnata ad uno sconosciuto autore, di cui non è il caso di occuparci qui, e che indicheremo, per ora, col nome di Pseudo Scauro."

⁴¹ For a detailed discussion on the few pieces of biographical information transmitted to us in the writings of Latin authors, see Tempesti (1977: 175ff.) and the discussion by Biddau (2008: xxvii–xxviii).

⁴² "But Terentius Scaurus, a highly distinguished grammarian of the time of the deified Hadrian, among other things which he wrote *On the Mistakes of Caesellius*, declared..." (translated by Rolfe 1927).

⁴³ *Hist. Aug. Ver. 2. 5*: "*audiuit Scaurinum grammaticum Latinum, Scauri filium, qui grammaticus Hadriani fuit.*"

⁴⁴ See the discussion by Biddau (2008: xxvii).

⁴⁵ Concerning the passage from Gellius quoted above, Tempesti argues that Scaurus did not, as many previous scholars have suggested, write a book (or a treatise) on the errors committed by another grammarian, Caesellius Vindex (1977: 181–184). Biddau (2008: xxx–xxx), however, does not fully agree. He thinks that such a work may have been included in Scaurus' oeuvre.

⁴⁶ Charisius 169, 20–21B: "*Im pro eum. nam ita Scaurus in arte grammatica disputavit, ...*" and 173, 4–5B: "*femininum mea ut Helena declinabitur*" inquit Scaurus artis grammaticae libris ...".

⁴⁷ Charisius 272, 25–30B: "*Primus pro in primis, ut Maro 'Troiae qui primus ab oris'; ubi Q. Terentius Scaurus commentariis in artem poeticam libro X 'non qui ante omnes' inquit 'sed ante quem nemo est', et addit 'quo genere plures primi accipi possunt'*" and 263, 9–12B: "*Impariter Horatius epistolarum: 'versibus impariter iunctis' ubi Q. Terentius Scaurus commentariis in artem poeticam libro X: adverbium inquit figuravit*". Depending on how these passages are interpreted, Scaurus wrote a commentary at least on the *Ars poetica* of Horace. Tempesti argues convincingly that he wrote a commentary in ten books on the whole oeuvre of Horace (1977: 193–194).

⁴⁸ Porphyrio adds an explanation by Scaurus to his comment on S. 2.5.92. This would seem to corroborate the activity of Scaurus as a commentator of also other works by Horace in addition to the *Ars poetica* (Tempesti 1977: 201).

On the basis of the quotations appearing both in Servius' commentary on Virgil and the *Scholia Veronensia*, Scaurus probably wrote a commentary on the works of Virgil as well (Tempesti 1977: 203). Rufinus quotes Scaurus and mentions his name at the end of his metrical treatise; this leads us to think that Scaurus wrote something also on the plays of Plautus.⁴⁹

The name of Scaurus is also mentioned in a discussion transmitted to us in Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* (GL 2: 547, 2–14). The passage concerns the length of the penultimate syllable in *ambitus*, which can act both as a noun and a participle. Scaurus is just one of the grammarians Priscian mentions in this context.⁵⁰ Similarly as in the passage in Gellius (11.15), we once more have a mention of a scholarly debate on a grammatical question, with Q. Terentius Scaurus participating along with other prominent grammarians.

So far we have seen evidence of Q. Terentius Scaurus, a *grammaticus* of the reign of Hadrian, taking part in the scholarly discussions of his age with other notable contemporary grammarians. The sources also suggest that he wrote an *ars grammatica* consisting of several books and commentaries on the works of Virgil and Horace, for instance. The picture of him that emerges from the aforementioned passages is that of a scholar, grammarian, and philologist. With this view in mind, Tempesti argues that the rest of the material attributed to Scaurus, the orthographical treatise *De orthographia* and the quotations in Diomedes' grammar and the *Explanationes in artem Donati*, is not compatible with the oeuvre of the second-century grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus. She sees this material as too removed from the study of literary texts and as something that is more at home in a later period, from the end of the third century to the beginning of the fourth century AD (Tempesti 1977: 217).

Unlike Tempesti, Federico Biddau, the editor of *De orthographia*, sees no significant problems in attributing that treatise to Q. Terentius Scaurus. He finds that the treatise contains notable similarities with the orthographical treatise by Velius Longus, a contemporary of Scaurus (Biddau 2008: xxxviii).⁵¹ Like Scaurus, Velius Longus is also known to have written a commentary on Virgil.⁵² Furthermore, orthographical issues formed a part of a grammarian's competence at that stage, as is confirmed, for instance, by the outline of *grammaticae* presented by Quintilian in book 1 of his *Institutio oratoria*.⁵³

⁴⁹ Cf. GL 6: 561, 23 and GL 6: 565, 1–6. Biddau (2008: xxx, n. 13), however, points out that these passages are very problematic, and, according to him, it does not seem wise to base one's hypothesis on them.

⁵⁰ Priscian GL 2: 547, 11: "... *quamvis Scaurus in utroque similem esse tenorem putavit*".

⁵¹ Velius Longus may have even known Scaurus' *De orthographia* (Biddau 2008: xxxix–xl).

⁵² Cf. Servius' commentary on the Aeneid (A. 10.245).

⁵³ Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.7.1–35.

The quotations of Scaurus in the grammar of Diomedes and the *Explanationes in artem Donati* are not accepted by Tempesti as belonging to the works of Q. Terentius Scaurus (1977: 217–218). Karl Barwick considers the material quoted by Diomedes as genuine, but that appearing in the *Explanationes* as not (1922: 86–87; 238–239). Regardless of whether we can always implicitly trust Diomedes' attribution, some of the doctrine attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes clearly does belong to an earlier period in Roman linguistics than the late third to early fourth century AD dating proposed for it by Tempesti (1977: 218). Particularly the tripartite division of the nominal parts of speech into *nomen*, *appellatio*, and *uocabulum* (see n. 77 below) and the singular definition of the adverb that Diomedes quotes greatly diverge from the doctrine occurring in the Late Latin *artes* from the late third century AD onward.

The views presented in this chapter so far are mostly based on indirect knowledge of a grammarian referred to as Scaurus in later grammatical texts and other literary works. As we have seen, this material, which has been available for centuries, has elicited different views from several scholars as to its authenticity. Next, we move on to analyze the evidence presented by Vivien Law in her 1987 article that argued for the attribution of the then newly discovered grammar to Q. Terentius Scaurus.

Law's attribution of the grammar to Q. Terentius Scaurus is ultimately based on the fact that the author of the *Explanationes in artem Donati*⁵⁴ quotes a grammarian called Scaurus in four instances, all of which agree almost to the letter with the text of the *APS* (referred to as M⁵⁵ by Law in her article).⁵⁶ Two of the passages are definitions (*ars*, *initium*) and the other two are lengthy passages from the chapter on the conjunction and preposition respectively. In addition, more than a dozen passages for which Ps.-Sergius does not name a source agree with the *APS* very closely.⁵⁷ So far, I agree with Law, who states that “the author of the *Explanationes*, working in the fifth or earlier part of the sixth century, thus knew M, and knew it as the work of one Scaurus” (1987: 73). Law then proceeds to compare the other material attributed to Scaurus in Latin grammatical texts to the text of the *APS*.

⁵⁴ On the dating and transmission of the *Explanationes in Donatum* of Ps.-Sergius, see Schindel (1975: 34–52), Holtz (1981: 340, 428), and De Paolis (2000: passim).

⁵⁵ Law refers to the unpublished text as M throughout her 1987 article. The letter M refers to Clm 6281, which now forms part of the manuscript collection in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich.

⁵⁶ The 1987 article prints the passages side by side to allow for an easy comparison (1987: 71–73). The sections in the *Explanationes* are the following: *GL* 4: 486 9ff.; 535, 5ff.; 560, 19–28, and 562, 1–16.

⁵⁷ Law lists the following sections in the *Explanationes* as agreeing with the *APS*: *GL* 4: 486, 15–487,2; 487, 3–10; 487, 14–16; 539, 36–540, 8; 540, 11–15; 543, 8–21; 543, 22–544, 6; 544, 15–35; 545, 1–9; 557, 4–15; 560, 28–561, 2; 561, 20–25 and 562, 19–25 (1987: 73 n. 13).

What strikes me as odd in Law's article is the fact that she does not in any way address the views put forward by, for instance, Barwick and Tempesti on the possible inauthenticity of some of the fragments attributed to a grammarian called Scaurus.⁵⁸ On the issue of the authenticity of the material attributed to Scaurus in Latin grammars, Law only quotes L. Holtz, who shares her opinion that the quotations of Scaurus in the *Explanationes* represent the authentic oeuvre of the second century AD grammarian.⁵⁹

As has already emerged from the discussion above, the content and context of some of the material attributed to Scaurus has a philological tenor. Thus Law, unsurprisingly, finds no connections between the *APS* and the material preserved in the grammars of Charisius or Priscian, for instance. The material preserved in Diomedes' grammar,⁶⁰ which is less directly concerned with particular literary usage and has more to do with the theoretical description of language,⁶¹ is more germane to her purpose, but still it does not offer totally conclusive evidence to support her arguments. As the *APS* does not contain a section on the so-called *vitia et virtutes orationis* (stylistics), a significant part of the material appearing in Diomedes' grammar is of no use to Law in her task.⁶² The same problem plagues the discussion on the *septimus casus* at *GL 1*: 317, 23ff., where Diomedes once again names Scaurus as his source, as such a discussion does not appear in the *APS*.⁶³ The material where comparison between the two texts is possible thus dwindles down to three definitions, namely those of *adverbium*, *oratio*, and *littera*. The definition of the adverb attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes (*GL 1*: 403, 20ff.), "*Scaurus ita definit, adverbium est modus rei dictionis ipsa pronuntiatione definitus, ut recte diligenter optime*",⁶⁴ is unique in extant Latin grammars; Law has to concede that it "has nothing to do with the standard Late Latin rendering, which stresses the suppletory and modifying functions of the adverb" (1987: 76). The *APS* contains a more familiar-looking definition of the adverb, "*Adverbium est pars orationis, quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat aut mutat*",⁶⁵ which only slightly diverges from the one appearing in

⁵⁸ It may be the case that Law did not know the 1977 article by Tempesti, but she refers to the 1922 monograph by Barwick on many occasions in her article. Thus she cannot have been ignorant on his views on the possible existence of two grammarians named Scaurus (see n. 39 above).

⁵⁹ Law (1987: 88 n. 68): "Cf. Holtz, Donat p. 101 n. 28: 'Rien dans la doctrine de Scaurus ici désigné, ni dans les citations que l'on trouve chez l'auteur des *Expl.* ne semble être indigne de Terentius Scaurus, grammairien du II^e siècle.'"

⁶⁰ For a list of the passages attributed to Scaurus in Diomedes' grammar, see the discussion in Law 1987: 75–79.

⁶¹ This fact made Tempesti reject the material preserved in Diomedes' grammar as inauthentic. Cf. Tempesti (1977: 217).

⁶² Cf. Diomedes' *ars grammatica* (*GL 1*: 444, 29ff.; 449, 26ff.; 456, 27–29). For Law's discussion on these passages, see (1987: 75–76).

⁶³ The passage where Scaurus is named as the source begins at *GL 1*: 318, 14.

⁶⁴ "Scaurus defines (it) in the following manner: the adverb is a method of uttering a thing which is bounded by its very pronunciation, such as correctly, carefully, competently."

⁶⁵ XIII, 3–4: "The adverb is a part of speech which is added to the verb to clarify or change its meaning."

Donatus' *Ars maior*,⁶⁶ for instance. The definitions of *oratio* and *littera* offer equally problematic results for Law's hypothesis.⁶⁷ The definition of *littera* in the *APS* differs completely from that which Diomedes attributes to Scaurus. Law points out, however, that the definition of *elementum* that follows the definition of *littera* in both the *APS* and Diomedes' grammar is partly the same in the two works.⁶⁸ The definitions of *elementum* may indeed partly coincide, but we cannot be sure that Diomedes meant to attribute also the definition of *elementum* to Scaurus. On the contrary, it seems that Diomedes is speaking of only *littera* when he writes "*Scaurus sic eam definit, littera est vocis eius quae scribi potest forma*" (*GL 1*: 421, 16–17).⁶⁹ This is also the view Barwick puts forward in his monograph (1922: 44 n. 3).⁷⁰ Thus the partial similarity of the definitions of *elementum* in the *APS* and Scaurus *apud* Diomedes is not relevant evidence for the possible similarity of the *APS* and the *ars grammatica* of Q. Terentius Scaurus.⁷¹

Law then moves on to analyze the subdivision in the word class *nomen* appearing in the *APS* and in Scaurus *apud* Diomedes.⁷² According to Law, the two discussions contain notable similarities (1987: 77–78). These similarities include, in her opinion, three names that are used as examples in both discussions (*Iuppiter*, *Apollo*, and *Cato*) and the fact that the account of *nomina propria* ('proper nouns') in the *APS* is more detailed than is usually the case in Latin grammars. These points of contact to which Law refers are, in my view, rather tenuous. The names *Cato*, *Apollo*, and *Iuppiter* are all attested as examples in numerous grammatical texts, with over 180 instances of the name *Cato*⁷³ in the *Corpus grammaticorum Latinorum* database (*CGL*), approximately 40 of *Apollo*, and around 110 of *Iuppiter*. Thus the mere occurrence of these examples is not weighty enough evidence to argue for a connection between the two texts. Also, the detailed account of proper nouns in the *APS* is not as unusual an occurrence as Law makes it out to

⁶⁶ 640, 2–3H: "*Aduerbiū est pars orationis, quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat atque inplet, ut iam faciam uel non faciam.*"

⁶⁷ Cf. the definition quoted by Diomedes (*GL 1*: 300, 19–20): "*Scaurus sic, oratio est ore missa et per dictiones ordinata pronuntiatio.*" The definition occurring in the *APS* is the following (VIII, 3): "*Oratio est significantibus uocibus secundum rationem ordinata sententia*". Diomedes attributes to Scaurus the following definition (*GL 1*: 421, 16–17): "*Scaurus sic eam definit, littera est vocis eius quae scribi potest forma.*" The *APS* contains a very different definition of *littera* (III, 3): "*Littera est elementum uocis articulatae.*" See also the discussion in Law (1987: 76–77).

⁶⁸ The following definition of *elementum* appears in Diomedes' grammar (*GL 1*: 421, 17–19): "*elementum est minima vis et indivisibilis materia vocis articulatae vel uniuscuiusque rei initium a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resolvitur.*" The *APS* has a similar, albeit shorter, definition (III, 3–4): "*Elementum est unius cuiusque rei initium a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resolvitur.*" See also the discussion by Law (1987: 77).

⁶⁹ "Scaurus defines it in the following manner: the letter is the (graphic) form of sound which can be written down."

⁷⁰ Barwick (1922: 44 n. 3): "Das Eigentum des Scaurus erstreckt sich aber bei Diom. offenbar nur auf die Definition der *littera*. Mit dieser hängt die folgende Definition des *elementum* nicht im geringsten zusammen."

⁷¹ On the similarities between Diomedes' *ars grammatica* and the *APS*, see chapter 1.4, p. 38ff.

⁷² *GL 1*: 320, 13–24 and IX, 6–10. See also the discussion by Reinikka (2008: 151–153).

⁷³ Around half of these instances refer to the writings of Cato and around half are instances where the name is used as an example. The former applies particularly to the instances occurring in the grammars of Charisius and Priscian.

be,⁷⁴ when we take into account that at least the grammars of Diomedes, Dositheus, and the *Anonymus Bobiensis* contain an analogous list of proper nouns.⁷⁵

In fact, the dissimilarities between the two passages are much more striking than the few similarities. The passage in the *APS* presents the standard Late Antique division of *nomen* into *nomen proprium* and *nomen appellativum*,⁷⁶ followed by examples of first proper nouns and, later on (IX, 14ff.), common nouns. Scaurus' doctrine, as reported by Diomedes, however, paints a very different picture indeed;⁷⁷ both the doctrine and the terminology (e.g., *appellatio* and *uocabulum*) seem to belong to a different stage of the Roman grammatical tradition. In the first century BC, Varro (*L.* 8.80)⁷⁸ distinguished between finite and infinite nominals (*finita/infinita*) using the term *nomen* for definite and individual entities (*res proprias*), such as *Paris* and *Helena*, and *uocabulum* for universals (*res communis*), such as *uir* and *mulier* ('man', 'woman').⁷⁹ When Quintilian briefly sketches the situation in the first century AD (*Inst.* 1.4.20), he mentions grammarians, such as Remmius Palaemon, who subordinate *uocabulum* or *appellatio* to *nomen*. However, this is not the only solution he describes; some grammarians consider *nomen* and *uocabulum* as separate parts of speech or differentiate even between *uocabulum* and *appellatio* in terms of corporeality (Luhtala 2002: 260–261).⁸⁰

Q. Terentius Scaurus, active in the early second century AD, would seem to belong to this last category in recognizing three nominal parts of speech, namely *nomen*, *appellatio*, and *uocabulum*. In his account, human beings and gods are expressed with *nomina*, which also distinguish them

⁷⁴ Law (1987: 78) describes this passage in the *APS* as "much more detailed than is usually the case" and an "uncommonly precise classification of *nomina propria*".

⁷⁵ See Diomedes (*GL I*: 320, 30–321,2), Dositheus (16, 2–6Bo), and the *Ars Bobiensis* (1, 14–2, 4D).

⁷⁶ IX, 6–10: "*Qualitas nominum bipertita est: aut enim propria sunt nomina, aut appellatiua. Propria sunt quae proprietas nominum tam deorum quam hominum quam montium quam urbium quam fluminum continent: deorum, ut 'Iuppiter, Apollo'; hominum, ut 'Cato' uel 'Cicero'; montium, ut 'Cynthus, Olympus'; urbium, ut 'Roma, Carthago'; fluminum, ut 'Nilus, Eridanus' et huiusmodi alia similia.*"

⁷⁷ Diomedes, *GL I*: 320, 13–24: "*sed ex hac definitione Scaurus dissentit. separat enim a nomine appellationem et uocabulum. et est horum trina definitio talis: nomen est quo deus aut homo propria dumtaxat discriminatione enuntiatur, cum dicitur ille Iuppiter, hic Apollo, item Cato iste, hic Brutus. appellatio quoque est communis similium rerum enuntiatio specie nominis, ut homo vir femina mancipium leo taurus. hoc enim animo auribusque audientis adfertur animalium esse quidem duo tantum genera, sed sine speciali discriminatione. nam nec quis homo nec quis vir nec quae femina nec quod mancipium nec qualis leo taurusve est definitur. appellationi accidunt eadem fere quae et nomini. item uocabulum est quo res inanimales vocis significatione specie nominis enuntiamus, ut arbor lapis herba toga et his similia.*"

⁷⁸ *L.* 8.80: "*Sequitur de nominibus, quae differunt a uoculis ideo quod sunt finita ac significant res proprias, Paris Helena, cum uocabula sint infinita ac res communis designant, ut vir mulier;*".

⁷⁹ See also the discussion by Luhtala (2002: 260).

⁸⁰ *Inst.* 1.4.20: "*Alii tamen ex idoneis dumtaxat auctoribus octo partes secuti sunt, ut Aristarchus et aetate nostra Palaemon, qui uocabulum sive appellationem nomini subiecerunt tamquam speciem eius, at ii qui aliud nomen, aliud uocabulum faciunt, novem. Nihilominus fuerunt qui ipsum adhuc uocabulum ab appellatione didicerent, ut esset uocabulum corpus visu tactuque manifestum: 'domus' 'lectus', appellatio cui vel alterum deesset vel utrumque: 'ventus' 'caelum' 'deus' 'virtus'.*"

from each other.⁸¹ Scaurus' definition of *nomen* (n. 77 above), proper noun, is inadequate and actually, as Luhtala (2010: 225–226) points out, very similar to the definition of the (proper) name.⁸² *Appellatio*, according to Scaurus, describes universals, or, as he phrases it, is an expression of similar things (*GL 1*: 320, 17–18): “*Appellatio ... est communis similium rerum enuntiatio*”. As the examples listed for *appellatio* suggest,⁸³ it is reserved for animate beings, but this is not mentioned in the actual definition and an additional clumsy explanation is needed to clarify this aspect.⁸⁴ Finally, *uocabulum* expresses inanimate things. In her analysis of this passage attributed to Scaurus, Luhtala considers the second-century grammarian to be “struggling with inadequate metalanguage, both philosophical and grammatical” (2010: 226). But this confusion in defining parts of speech is only to be expected, considering that philosophical vocabulary was introduced into the Latin language only in the first century BC and that for some time after the knowledge of this terminology was rather sketchy (Luhtala 2010: 227). For evidence on this question, Luhtala (2010: 227–230) turns to a survey by Fuhrmann⁸⁵ on various Roman *artes* from the beginning of the first century BC to the end of the second century AD. This survey sheds light on the defining practices employed in these *artes*. Luhtala's analysis of the doctrine found in Quintilian and Scaurus *apud* Diomedes show that these authors write in full accordance with the philosophical and grammatical knowledge of their period (2010: 230).

The material contained in the *APS*, on the other hand, clearly belongs to a later period. All the definitions of the parts of speech, for instance, reveal a more confident grasp of the relevant terminology.⁸⁶ Also, the method of the essential definition, which was first described in the Latin tradition in Cicero's *Topica*,⁸⁷ is attested for the first time in Latin grammar in the late third century

⁸¹ One further divergence between the account of *nomen* in the *APS* and Scaurus *apud* Diomedes is that the definition of *nomen* attributed to Scaurus excludes all other proper nouns except those expressing human beings and gods, whereas the definition of *nomina propria* appearing in the *APS* does not have this restriction. Thus many of the examples of *nomina propria* appearing in the *APS* (*Cynthus, Olympus, Roma, Carthago, Nilus, and Eridanus*) would, apparently, not be labelled as *nomina* by Scaurus and would not actually be accounted for in any way in his tripartite system. See also Luhtala (2010: 225): “However, this definition [*sc.* that of *nomen* by Scaurus] exhibits some infelicities. The proper noun is restricted to human beings and gods, whereas place names are excluded.”

⁸² Cf. Cicero's definition of the proper name appearing in the *De inventione* (1.24): “*Nomen est cuique personae, quo quaeque suo proprio et certo vocabulo appellatur.*”

⁸³ *GL 1*: 320, 18–19: “... *ut homo vir femina mancipium leo taurus.*”

⁸⁴ *GL 1*: 320, 19–22: “*hoc enim animo auribusque audientis adfertur animalium esse quidem duo tantum genera, sed sine speciali discriminatione. nam nec quis homo nec quis uir nec quae femina nec quod mancipium nec qualis leo taurus est definitur.*”

⁸⁵ Fuhrmann (1960).

⁸⁶ For example, the verb *significare* (‘to signify’), which was lacking from the definitions of Scaurus (appearing in Diomedes' grammar, n. 77 above), appears in the definitions of three parts of speech in the *APS*.

⁸⁷ Cf. *Top.* 4.26–6.29. Although Cicero wrote on essential definitions in the first century BC, such definitions do not appear in the Roman *artes* studied by Fuhrmann or the grammatical material that survives from the period before the end of the third century AD. In his treatise, Cicero mentions also other types of definitions; these include division (*diuisio*, 5.28) and etymological definitions (*notatio*, 8.35), which appear in the *artes* studied by Fuhrmann and early grammatical texts (cf. the discussion in Luhtala 2010: 227–229, 232).

AD, when all the surviving definitions in Marius Plotius Sacerdos' grammar take the form 'x is a part of speech'. Thus the earliest possible dating for the *APS*, which makes use of this method, is late third century, which precludes the attribution of this text to Q. Terentius Scaurus (2nd c. AD).

When Vivien Law made her attribution of the newly discovered grammar to Q. Terentius Scaurus in 1987, she considered the *Techne grammatike* attributed to Dionysius Thrax to be authentic. Later she accepted the view according to which only the opening chapters of the *Techne* are authentic.⁸⁸ This obviously had implications for the attribution of this grammar, as the beginnings of the Latin grammars of the *Schulgrammatik* genre had to be reconsidered. Thus we find another, broader dating in Law's 1990 article: "a grammar of the second or third century A.D. ascribed to a grammarian called Scaurus (though whether he was identical with the renowned Q. Terentius Scaurus is open to question)" (1990: 92). Law did not further discuss the issue of the attribution and dating of the *APS*, or finish her edition of the text before her untimely death in 2002.

As already argued in my article in 2008, the *APS* cannot be the *Ars minor* of Q. Terentius Scaurus.⁸⁹ At some stage of the transmission of the *APS*, the name of a famous grammarian, Scaurus, was associated with the text. No trace of that, however, remains in the extant manuscripts.⁹⁰ The theory considered by Barwick,⁹¹ namely that another grammarian by the same name wrote the work quoted in the *Explanationes in artem Donati*, seems to me improbable considering that it was relatively common for later works to be attributed to famous grammarians of the first centuries AD, such as Remmius Palaemon or Valerius Probus.⁹² That Q. Terentius Scaurus was indeed highly regarded in the centuries after his death is confirmed by the opinions of the fourth-century authors, Arnobius and Ausonius, who add Scaurus to the names of other prominent early grammarians, such as Probus, Asper, Varro, and Verrius Flaccus.⁹³ Tempesti (1977: 178) sees this enduring fame as one of the reasons why several grammatical works were later falsely attributed to Q. Terentius Scaurus.⁹⁴

⁸⁸ See, for instance, her view on the *Techne* appearing in a later article (1995: 117–118): "... but it seems to me that these phenomena are more easily explained by supposing that the *Technē* originated at the earliest in the second or early third century and rose to prominence not before the later third or fourth, rather in the way that Donatus was to do in the Roman world from the end of the fourth."

⁸⁹ See Reinikka (2008: 157).

⁹⁰ See chapter 1.1 for a discussion on the manuscripts that preserve the *APS*.

⁹¹ Barwick (1922: 87): "Es muß, wenn kein Irrtum der Überlieferung vorliegt, einen jüngeren Grammatiker dieses Namens gegeben haben. An sich steht dem nichts im Wege: wie einen jüngeren Probus, ebensogut kann es einen jüngeren Scaurus gegeben haben."

⁹² In addition to Q. Terentius Scaurus, Tempesti mentions also Remmius Palaemon and Valerius Probus as examples of grammarians to whom later writings have been falsely attributed (1977: 217).

⁹³ See Arnobius (I 59.19) and Ausonius (*opusc.* III 18; XVI 16, 12; XVI 21, 7; *epist.* 13.27) (Tempesti 1977: 178).

⁹⁴ "Nel IV sec. dunque la fama di Scauro ... è ancora diffusa, tanto da essere avvicinata a quella dei più noti maestri della lingua latina; il che giustifica l'attribuzione di una più vasta, ma indubbiamente più tarda, opera grammaticale."

One of the reasons why the name of Scaurus was associated at some stage with the *APS* may be found in the text itself. An example appearing in the chapter on the pronoun contains the name Scaurus: “*Nam cum debeam dicere: ‘artem Scaurus scripsit’, dico: ‘artem ille scripsit’, et pro ‘artem Scaurus scripsisti’ dico: ‘artem tu scripsisti’*” (X, 4–5). This example may have prompted someone to attribute the grammar to Scaurus.⁹⁵ Law thinks that the author of the *Explanationes* may have done just this (1987: 73 n. 15). She also hints at a practice that was prevalent in Antiquity, namely that of grammarians using their own names as examples in their works.⁹⁶ I do not, however, want to base an attribution solely on such questionable evidence. Some grammarians undoubtedly did use their own names as examples, but certainly names of renowned grammarians could also be used to lend authority to a text. I consider it possible that famous grammarians’ names could be used as examples in grammars without necessarily implying any direct connection to them.⁹⁷

Thus, there is, in my view, not enough evidence to posit the existence of a younger Scaurus. Rather, the frequency with which later critics, librarians, or copyists knowingly or unwittingly mislabelled anonymous works with prestigious names⁹⁸ supports the hypothesis that we are dealing with another pseudepigraphic work from Late Antiquity. The attribution to a Scaurus of this text by the author of the *Explanationes*, however, allows us to refer to the grammar as *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* (cf. n. 40 above). The characterization appearing in an article by Vivien Law seems very accurate also as regards the author of this work (1984: 155): “Most of the *grammatici* of the later Roman Empire are obscure figures, known to us only through their writings. Few, as far as we know, had professional interests beyond the classroom, and it is unusual to find evidence of a grammarian outside the pages of his work. ... Exceptions are rare – most of those who wrote grammars in late Antiquity remained professional schoolteachers known to us only through their textbooks.”

⁹⁵ In his article on the *Explanationes in Donatum*, Paolo De Paolis (2000: 194) discusses a comparable incident where, lacking any other information, material in the text may have prompted scribes to attribute an anonymous text to a known grammarian. The first part of the *Explanationes* is attributed in the manuscripts to a Servius, which cannot be accurate, as the author himself refers to the grammarian Servius: “*haec magister Servius extrinsecus dictavit*”. According to De Paolis (2000: 194 n. 61), “Che questa posse essere la genesi dell’equivoco mi sembra confermato dal fatto che codici come il *Monac.* 6281 trascrivono questa frase ... come un *titulus*, mostrando così di intendere che il testo che segue debba essere attribuito a Servio.”

⁹⁶ Law refers to Karl Barwick using this method to trace passages from the works of the grammarian Pansa in later grammatical texts (1987: 73 n. 15). See also Barwick (1922: 169–170). Also Tolkiehn (1910: 157) considers the use of one’s own name a recurring feature in the works of ancient grammarians.

⁹⁷ Some grammarians do indeed use their own names as examples (e.g., Priscian *GL* 2: 448, 22–24), but other grammarians’ names were also used as examples in Late Antique Latin grammars. Cf., for example, Ps.-Probus’ *Catholica* (*GL* 4: 32, 7–9): “*nominativus singularis fit modis quindecim, a, e utraque, i, o utraque, u l m n r s x c t, poeta monile Danae gummi Varro Dido genu mel bonum carmen orator sacerdos verax lac caput*.” Cf. also p. 145 n. 6.

⁹⁸ See Tempesti (1977: 217) and Speyer (1971: 37ff.).

1.3 The Structure of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* and its Dating

There is no preface in the *APS* as it stands in the manuscript in which it has been transmitted to us. Whether this always was the case or whether it was lost at some stage of the transmission of the text is impossible to judge on the evidence we have available.⁹⁹ As a result, we cannot rely on the views of the author himself as to the scope of the work, its recipient(s) or dedicatee(s),¹⁰⁰ or its intended audience. Besides, lacking a preface, we are denied valuable material that might hint at the cultural context of the author or a more precise dating of his work. Thus, in absence of evidence given by the author himself and possessing no other biographical information on the pseudonymous author, we must turn to the internal features of the extant text to arrive at a conjecture as to the dating and context of the *APS*.

The *APS* belongs to the so-called *Schulgrammatik*¹⁰¹ genre of ancient grammar. This type presents the canonical eight parts of speech in a systematic manner. The *Schulgrammatik* genre is one of the four types of grammatical texts that have come down to us from Late Antiquity.¹⁰² According to Law, the features that characterize works belonging to the *Schulgrammatik* genre are their rigorously hierarchical structure, their systematic structure within chapters, a logical organization of subject matter reflecting the presumed logical structure of language, and the tendency to foreground semantic categories and correspondingly to relegate formal categories to second place (2003: 65). In her monograph on the history of linguistics, Law includes the *APS* in her list of extant grammars belonging to the *Schulgrammatik* genre (2003: 66).¹⁰³ This genre seems to include works very different in their scope and structure and cannot therefore in itself be considered an exhaustive description. Luhtala (2010: 213), for instance, voices her criticism of the

⁹⁹ The remark preserved in the preface to book 1 of the *Explanations*, “*Scaurus vero hinc coepit, ‘ars est ...’*” (*GL* 4: 486, 9–10), does not exclude the existence of a preface.

¹⁰⁰ The dedicatees of grammatical works were often sons, students, political figures, and the like. On this subject, see Munzi (1992: 112ff).

¹⁰¹ This term has its origins in the 1922 monograph by Barwick, as also Law explains: “This not wholly appropriate name – for why should the label of ‘school grammar’ be reserved for one type of grammar and not another? – was bestowed upon a particularly important lost work of the type by the German classicist Karl Barwick in 1922” (2003: 65).

¹⁰² The other three genres of grammatical texts are: *regulae* or *kanones* (‘rules’), which explore the formal features of some or all of the parts of speech, *partitiones* (‘divisions’) or parsing grammars, which analyze individual head-words in a sentence, and grammatical commentaries, which were created to accompany the study of the *Schulgrammatik*-type grammars (Luhtala 2013: 356).

¹⁰³ Law lists 16 grammars deemed by her “wholly or partly of the *Schulgrammatik* genre” (2003: 66). The grammars included in her list are (in chronological order): the *Ars* of Scaurus, the *Ars* of Asper, the *Artes grammaticae* of Sacerdos, the *Instituta artium* of (Ps.-)Probus, the *Ars* of (Maximus) Victorinus, the *Ars maior* and *Ars minor* of Donatus, the *Ars grammatica* of Marius Victorinus, the *Ars grammatica* of Charisius, the *Ars grammatica* of Diomedes, the *Ars breviata* of Augustine, the *Ars grammatica* of Dositheus, the *Excerpta* of Audax, the *Ars de nomine et verbo* of Consentius, the *Ars* of *Anonymus Bobiensis*, and the *Institutiones grammaticae* of Priscian.

idea that the grammars of this genre would constitute a very uniform group; in fact, according to her, the description of *Schulgrammatik* “only properly matches Donatus’ *Ars maior* and Priscian’s *Institutiones grammaticae*” among the grammars deemed to belong to the *Schulgrammatik* genre (see n. 103 above).¹⁰⁴

In her writings regarding the *APS*, Law characterizes this work also as an elementary grammar and, slightly confusingly, a school grammar as distinct from a *Schulgrammatik*-type grammar.¹⁰⁵ In what follows the *APS* is considered an elementary grammar belonging to the *Schulgrammatik* genre.¹⁰⁶ To avoid confusion, we do not use the term ‘school grammar’¹⁰⁷ in the present volume, although the text was most likely used in teaching. No other extant ancient grammar has exactly the same structure as the *APS*, which contains chapters on *ars*, *uox*, *litterae*, *syllabae*, *dictio*, *locutio*, *definitio*, *oratio*,¹⁰⁸ *nomen*, *pronomen*, *uerbum*, *participium*, *aduerbium*, *praepositio*, *coniunctio*, and *interiectio*. Law (1987: 68) considers the *APS* to be on a scale similar to that of Donatus’ *Ars maior* and “typologically close” to it, but not dependent on that work. The *APS* diverges from the *Ars maior* of Donatus, however, in that it lacks the so-called third part of grammar, the section on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*. In addition to Donatus’ *Ars maior*, this section can be found also in many other, but by no means all, *Schulgrammatik*-type grammars.¹⁰⁹

Based on the extant manuscripts and other evidence available to us, we cannot be sure whether this omission is due to an accident of transmission, or whether it reflects the original plan

¹⁰⁴ See also Luhtala (2010: 217ff). Marc Baratin (1994: 144), analyzing the structure of third and fourth century *artes*, finds that there are “des différences dans le choix même des sujets, dans leur organisation, et dans la répartition de chaque ensemble.” He also points out that “l’*Ars* s’est imposée comme type de description, mais ne semble pas avoir de structure interne précise” (1994: 145). Cf. also the view expressed by Matthews (1994: 76).

¹⁰⁵ Writing on the *Ars breuiata* of Augustine, Law refers also to the *APS*: “The *Ars breuiata* ... adheres to the traditional structure of the elementary grammar manifested in the works of Donatus and Scaurus and the surviving fragments of Cominianus” (1984: 166). In her 1987 article focusing on the *APS*, she describes the work as a ‘school grammar’: “It contains chapter on *ars*, *uox*, ..., thus conforming to the traditional pattern of the Late Latin school grammar” (1987: 70). While clarifying that term, it becomes clear that a text belonging to the *Schulgrammatik* genre is not what Law refers to: “In what follows the term ‘school grammar’ will be restricted to those works which, like Donatus’s two grammars, are relatively brief, possess a coherent structure, and, in their chapters on the parts of speech, deal systematically with the accidentia. This definition includes, apart from the *Ars minor* and the *Ars maior*, the grammars attributed to Asper and Dositheus, Augustine’s *Ars breuiata*, the surviving fragments of the grammar of Marius Victorinus, and the fragments of Cominianus’s grammar preserved by Charisius. It excludes rambling compilations like the grammars of Charisius, Diomedes and Sacerdos, works devoted largely to metrics like those of Audax and Victorinus, commentaries on Donatus, and works deliberately structured in a different way, like the grammars of Priscian, Phocas, Eutyches, and collections of *Regulae* like those attributed to Augustine and Palaemon” (1987: 70 n. 10).

¹⁰⁶ However, while using this established term which has its origins in the 1922 monograph by Barwick, I do not subscribe to his views as to the origin of that genre. See also the discussion on p. 19ff.

¹⁰⁷ The term ‘school grammar’ was, however, used in my 2008 article.

¹⁰⁸ The chapters on *dictio*, *locutio*, *definitio*, and *oratio* consist of only a definition (followed by an example in the case of *oratio*).

¹⁰⁹ It can be found, for instance, in Augustine’s *Ars breuiata*, the *Excerpta* of Audax, the *Artes grammaticae* by Sacerdos, the *Ars* of Charisius, the *Ars* of Diomedes, and the *Ars* of Cominianus (partially preserved in the grammar of Charisius). Priscian’s *Institutiones grammaticae* reserves its final section to syntax rather than stylistics.

of the *APS*. In her article, Law analyzes the structure of the manuscript¹¹⁰ in which the *APS* is transmitted to us and concludes that “the makeup of Clm 6281 gives us no cause to think that a chapter on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis* was ever meant to form part of this copy of the grammar” (1987: 75–76), but she adds that such a passage may have been lost at an earlier stage of the transmission of the text. As Law herself points out (1987: 76 n. 23), several grammars belonging to the *Schulgrammatik* genre lack a section on this subject, for example the grammars of Dositheus, Victorinus, and Asper, Donatus’ *Ars minor*, as well as the *Instituta artium* attributed to Probus. That the omission was, perhaps, intentional, or at least took place early in the transmission of the text, seems to be confirmed by the second book of the *Explanationes*; the compiler of that work may have used a version of the *APS* that did not include a section on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*. This view is based on the fact that he does not quote Scaurus in the chapters on stylistics that follow the discussion on the parts of speech in his work.¹¹¹ However, this *argumentum ex silentio* alone hardly constitutes conclusive evidence on the matter: the compiler of the *Explanationes* may have simply chosen to follow another source on that subject.

In her article, Law regards the *APS* as preserved in its entirety (1987: 68),¹¹² and I see no compelling reason to disagree with her. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, not all grammars of the *Schulgrammatik* genre contain a section on stylistics; considering the variation among the grammars belonging to that genre, there is no need to suppose that they all would adhere to exactly the same pattern.¹¹³

Now I briefly examine the *Schulgrammatik* genre of Latin grammar and its most prominent representative, the *Ars maior* of Donatus. According to the traditional historiographical model of Latin *ars grammatica* as presented particularly in Karl Barwick’s influential monograph, Donatus was writing in a well-established tradition of *Schulgrammatik*, which ultimately originated in the

¹¹⁰ Cf. Law (1987: 76): “The quires were numbered by a contemporary hand, and none are lacking in our portion of the manuscript (ff. 52r–62v): quire VIII, a quaternion, finishes with f. 58, and quire VIII consists irregularly of a binion (ff. 59–62) added expressly to complete this grammar before the start of a new quire and text on f. 63r. The scribe thus seems to have had no intention of adding any further section to this grammar: presumably his exemplar contained nothing more.”

¹¹¹ Cf. the brief section on stylistics included in the edition by Keil (*GL* 4: 563, 1–565, 31). For the edition of the whole section on the virtues and vices of speech, see Schindel (1975: 258–279).

¹¹² Law considers the *APS* “a complete, self-contained ancient grammar” (1987: 68). See also Law (1987: 82): “... and the lack of the extraneous material (e.g. on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*) found in all other Late Latin grammars hint that with this work [sc. the *APS*] we may be closer to the beginnings of the Roman school grammar than the evidence previously available could permit.”

¹¹³ See the discussion on p. 17ff. above. Cf. also Baratin’s view on some of the grammars of this genre (1994: 143–144): “Ce plan [sc. de l’*Ars maior*] est caractérisé d’une part par une perspective ascendante, qui conduit des éléments minimaux jusqu’aux classes de mots, et d’autre part par l’importance qu’il accorde aux ‘défauts et qualités de l’énoncé’. Ce plan est peut-être le plus ‘achevé’ – c’est affaire d’appréciation – mais on ne peut pas dire qu’il représente l’unique modèle du schéma artigraphique. Si l’on examine en effet les autres grandes *Artes* du 3^e et du 4^e siècles qui nous sont parvenues, celles de Sacerdos, de Charisius et de Diomède, on se trouve en présence de plans tout à fait différents.”

first century AD grammar of Remmius Palaemon. That work would in turn have been a Latin adaptation of the *Techne grammatike* of the Alexandrian grammarian Dionysius Thrax (c. 100 BC).¹¹⁴ In the model presented by Barwick, Latin *ars grammatica* did not undergo significant developments after the first century AD.¹¹⁵ This traditional view has been challenged in the past decades by scholars such as Vincenzo Di Benedetto,¹¹⁶ Jan Pinborg,¹¹⁷ Michael Frede,¹¹⁸ Daniel Taylor,¹¹⁹ and, most recently, Anneli Luhtala. In her monograph *Grammar and Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, she argues that significant developments took place in grammar even after it became an independent discipline, due to the “lively interaction with philosophy” in the first three centuries AD (Luhtala 2005: 8). This view suggests that instead of continuing in a well-established tradition of *Schulgrammatik*, Donatus’ work actually “represents a culmination of a renovation of the grammatical method”¹²⁰ (Luhtala 2010: 211). As Luhtala points out, the traditional historiographical model offers no convincing explanation for the success of Donatus’ grammars:¹²¹ in a well-established tradition of *Schulgrammatik*, presumably consisting of numerous works of the same scope and intent, his success is indeed hard to justify (2010: 210). But considering that some of the developments in grammar were fairly recent, it makes more sense to have the (only) grammar that had fully integrated those developments, namely Donatus’ *Ars maior*, become “the canonical representative of the state of grammatical science in the third and fourth centuries AD” (Luhtala 2010: 211). No other ancient grammars have, in fact, exactly the same scope or objective as

¹¹⁴ See also Steinthal (1890, 1891) and, more recently, Robins (1951, 1967) and Della Casa (1973).

¹¹⁵ Cf. also the view expressed by Law in her article: “That the genre did exist much earlier [sc. than Donatus’ works] can be inferred from several sources. The grammars of Charisius and Sacerdos, both rambling compilations which draw on several sources, make use of lost school grammars. ... Two fragments from a Latin grammar dating from the beginning of the third century, or perhaps earlier, have been found in Egypt. Its points of contact with other late Antique grammars, including M [sc. the *APS*], suggest that it belonged to an already well established genre, although school grammars earlier than this are lacking” (1987: 81).

¹¹⁶ See Di Benedetto (1958), (1959), and (1990).

¹¹⁷ J. Pinborg (1975).

¹¹⁸ M. Frede (1977) and (1978).

¹¹⁹ In his article “Rethinking the History of Language Science in Classical Antiquity”, Taylor argues, for instance, that “the Alexandrians were first and foremost philologists, not grammarians” (1987: 12–13). He also argues that Dionysius Thrax’s position as the model for all subsequent Greek and Latin grammars should be questioned (1987: 10–11). Furthermore, Taylor thinks that there existed a lack of uniformity in the study of the newly independent science (1987: 10–11). Luhtala (2005: 7–8), however, criticizes Taylor’s model on the basis that he limits the influence of philosophy to the pre-Christian era (cf. Taylor 1987: 13) and focuses excessively on the autonomy of grammar from the related disciplines (cf. Taylor 1987: 11, 13–14).

¹²⁰ Cf. Luhtala (2010: 240): “This renovation owed may of its central features to the work of Apollonius Dyscolus, who, according to Priscian, ‘emended the art of grammar with some rational principles’ (*GL* 2: 1, 12). These principles include, in my view, definitions of the parts of speech as well as the philosophical apparatus of grammar as a whole.”

¹²¹ Cf. Luhtala (2010: 240 n. 74): “According to Barwick, Donatus’ success is accidental: ‘Die Leistung des Don. wird heute meist überschätzt, weil man nicht weiß (...), daß seine *ars* nichts anderes ist als eines der vielen einander sehr ähnlichen Schulbücher, von denen sie zufällig im späteren Altertum und Mittelalter die Schulgrammatik schlechthin geworden ist.’ (1922: 11).”

Donatus' two works.¹²² Their success is more readily understandable in Luhtala's historiographical model. As a result, we must now consider where the *APS* stands with regard to this new historiographical model of Latin *Schulgrammatik*.

In her article in 1987, Law sees in the structure of the *APS* echoes of the Stoic linguistic doctrine (1987: 81–82).¹²³ She highlights the similar structure of the assumed plan of the Stoic *Τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς*¹²⁴ and the *APS* (Law 1987: 81–82), citing its “lack of the extraneous material found in all other Late Latin grammars”¹²⁵ as one clue to its early dating (Law 1987: 82). However, as there is very little evidence for the presence of philosophical concepts in grammar before Apollonius Dyscolus, and as the study of Stoic logic, for instance, was largely neglected until the first and second centuries AD, when commentaries begin to appear (Luhtala 2005: 30–31, 151–152),¹²⁶ any claim of direct influence from Diogenes of Babylon, for example, must be written off. And since there is no extant Stoic grammar, either Greek or Latin, that could have provided the model for the *APS*, we must look for other explanations as to its structure.

In 2010, Anneli Luhtala suggested that Donatus' works deal with grammar in a much narrower sense than those of some of his contemporaries, such as Diomedes and Charisius. She points out that the picture emerging from Quintilian's description of grammar (*Institutio oratoria*, book 1) is that of a science intimately associated with literature and philology, and that this view is echoed in some of the Late Antique Latin grammars as well (2010: 214–220). Donatus' works, however, have much less to do with the study of literature; indeed, the *Ars minor* could be the earliest manual of purely technical nature (2010: 215–216). The *Ars maior* is somewhat more traditional, as particularly its final part, on stylistics, includes topics connected with the study of literature (2010: 216). However, whereas the sections of the *Ars maior* that deal with literature (that is, the sections on letters, syllables, and metrical feet, as well as the discussion on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*) have numerous literary examples, the discussion on the parts of speech is

¹²² As also Law remarks in her article: “Surprisingly, relatively few Late Latin grammars are directly comparable with Donatus' two works, in scale or structure or both” (1987:68).

¹²³ For her later views on the subject, see Law (2003: 38–39): “And yet their [sc. Stoics'] concern to fathom the nature and possibilities of language led them to bring together ideas from Aristotelian dialectic, rhetoric and natural philosophy and organise them into a structure which in some respects prefigures that of the ancient grammatical treatise as it was to emerge centuries later. Writing a grammar as such was not their intention, however.”

¹²⁴ This outline is based on the *Τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς* of Diogenes of Babylon (2nd cent. BC) as preserved in the *Vitae philosophorum* of Diogenes Laertius (3rd cent. AD).

¹²⁵ These elements were considered by Law (1987: 82) to include chapters on *syllaba*, *accentus*, *pedes*, *positurae*, and the *uitia et virtutes orationis*. She cites Holtz (1981: 58–74) and (Barwick 1922: passim) for details of the process whereby the additional material found its way into Late Latin grammars.

¹²⁶ According to Luhtala (2005: 151), the interaction between grammar and philosophy took place in Late Antiquity, when the conditions for such interaction were much more favourable than at the time the *Techne* would have been written (c. 100 BC), if it were authentic. This was a time when Aristotle's categories and Stoic logic, for example, were not studied even by philosophers (Luhtala 2005: 151).

practically devoid of them (Luhtala 2013: 359). As mentioned above, the *APS* does not include a section on stylistics; the bulk of its text deals with the parts of speech. That section contains only 11 literary examples, mostly from Virgil. This is in contrast to the section on the syllable in the *APS*, the only one with relatively strong connections with literature, which has 10 literary examples in a little over 30 lines of text. It seems, thus, that the author of the *APS*, similarly to Donatus, concentrates on technical grammar at the expense of the study of literature that characterizes many other Late Antique Latin grammars, such as those of Diomedes or Sacerdos. In its lack of discussion on metrical feet or the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*, the *APS* comes very close to being a manual of purely technical nature, autonomous of the study of literature, as, for instance, the *Ars minor* of Donatus.

From these themes of a more general nature, I now proceed to discuss more particular questions as regards the structure and dating of the *APS*. In her 1987 article, Law examined various internal features of the *APS* (1987: 80–84). She ultimately comes to the conclusion that the grammar is the work of Q. Terentius Scaurus, but, ahead of this, she brings up several characteristics that can help with the dating of the *APS*. I have already analyzed these points in my 2008 article (Reinikka 2008: 155–156), but it will be useful to re-examine them here, along with evidence that was not included in the aforementioned articles by Law and Reinikka.

The *terminus ante quem* for the *APS* is the date of the *Explanationes*, which Law gives as fifth to sixth century AD (1987: 80).¹²⁷ In the article by De Paolis (see also chapter 1.1), it is argued that the *Explanationes* actually consists of two works: an earlier commentary on the *Ars minor* and a later continuation of the first work, a commentary on the *Ars maior* consisting of excerpts (2000: 193–198). De Paolis also gives a cautious dating for both parts, late fourth to mid sixth century for the commentary on the *Ars minor*,¹²⁸ and, for the commentary on the *Ars maior*, a dating in the early Medieval period cannot be ruled out.¹²⁹ With such an uncertain *terminus ante quem*, we must turn to the internal evidence provided by the text of the *APS* in order to arrive at a more useful dating for the text.

¹²⁷ Law (1987: 73 n. 14) refers to Schindler's (1975: 34–53) and Holtz's (1981: 340, 428) works for the dating of the *Explanationes*. Holtz gives a dating of later fifth century, whereas Schindler opts for a fifth to sixth century dating.

¹²⁸ De Paolis (2000: 218): "Ne esce innanzi tutto confermata, se mai ce ne fosse stato bisogno, la composizione del testo in età tardoantica, fra Servio e la metà del VI secolo dopo Cristo."

¹²⁹ De Paolis (2000: 199): "Lo studio accurato di questi materiali consentirà senza dubbio di avanzare qualche ipotesi concreta su un compilatore, che se da un canto deve essere molto probabilmente collocato in un'epoca piuttosto tarda (oserei dire più altomedievale che tardoantica), doveva però avere accesso ad una ampia collezione di opere grammaticali. La presenza fra gli estratti appena ricordati di testi riconducibili a Bobbio, come il *De finalibus* di Metronio e il breve *De structuris*, può valere in questa fase solo come suggestione ed indicazione di un possibile percorso, ancora tutto da verificare."

Among the issues Law brings up in her article is the order in which the parts of speech are treated in the *APS*: *nomen, pronomem, uerbum, participium, aduerbium, praepositio, coniunctio, interiectio* (1987: 82–83). This order is followed by, in addition to Ps.-Scaurus, Diomedes, Dositheus, and Ps.-Palaemon, and another similar version, retaining the proximity of the verb and the participle, but with the conjunction preceding the preposition, is followed by Charisius, Victorinus, and Ps.-Augustine (Law 1984: 160). Thus Law argues that the *APS* cannot be “significantly later than Donatus’ *floruit* (s. IV med.)” as after the rapid success of Donatus’ grammars, the order *nomen, pronomem, uerbum, aduerbium, participium, coniunctio, praepositio, interiectio* predominated (Law 1987: 82–83).¹³⁰

In her discussion, Law then turns to examine the literary quotations occurring in the *APS*. The literary quotations mostly consist of lines from Virgil’s *Aeneid* and *Georgics*. Two other first century BC authors, Catullus and Sallust, are quoted once. Plautus, from the second century BC, is mentioned in passing with reference to a specific point of grammatical doctrine, but without a proper quotation.¹³¹ All these authors were active before the end of the first century BC. Authors such as Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal, who were often quoted by Servius and his successors after the 380s but rarely earlier, are missing from the *APS* (Law 1987: 83).¹³² Law also points out that the latest figures to appear in the text of the *APS* who can be identified and dated, Nero and Otho, provide a *terminus post quem* of 68/69 AD for the text (1987: 83).

Now I turn to analyze evidence not included in Law’s 1987 article. In another article written by Law, in 1984, she examines the possibility of attributing the *Ars breuiata* or *Regulae* (Ps.) *Augustini* to Augustine. That article discusses issues touching also upon the *APS*. For example, concerning the traces of Christianity found in the *Ars breuiata*, Law points out that this is a rare feature in Late Latin grammars.¹³³ In a note she further specifies that “Priscian includes a fairly

¹³⁰ Priscian is obviously an exception to this rule, but he looked to his Greek sources for the order adopted in the *Institutiones*. Cf., for example, *GL* 3: 24, 2–8: “*quoniam de omnibus, ut potui, declinabilibus supra disserui, id est de nomine et uerbo et participio et pronomine, nunc ad indeclinabilia ueniam, quae iure extrema ponuntur: ea enim sine illis sententiam complere non possunt, illa uero sine istis saepissime complent. itaque cum mihi bene uideantur praepositionem ceteris indeclinabilibus Graecorum doctissimi praeposuisse, et maxime Apollonius, cuius auctoritatem in omnibus sequendam putavi, ego quoque ab ea incipiam*” and *GL* 2: 548, 2–7: “*qui tertio loco participium posuerunt, rectius fecisse uidentur. cum enim nomen et uerbum primum et secundum tenuerunt locum, participium, quod ex utroque nascitur, sequentem iure exigit. quaesitum est tamen, an bene separauerint id ab aliis partibus grammatici et primus Trypho, quem Apollonius quoque sequitur, maximus auctor artis grammaticae.*”

¹³¹ See VIII, 4–6, XI, 54–55, and XVI, 7.

¹³² Cf. Wessner (1929: 296–303, 328–335). This issue is raised also in the edition of the *Regulae* of Ps.-Palemon by Rosellini and in the edition of the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine by Martorelli. The presence of these *poetae iuniores* is considered as evidence that the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine most likely originates from the fourth or fifth century AD (Martorelli 2011: cxii).

¹³³ Law (1984: 173): “Christianity is scarcely hinted at in late Antique grammars before Priscian (c. 500). Even in Priscian’s writings it is confined to notes on the declension of Greek and Hebrew loanwords. Such remarks on Greek as one finds in earlier grammars, like Charisius, are Classical and comparative rather than Christian in inspiration.”

large number of such words [that is, Christian references] (mostly proper names) in his *Institutiones grammaticae*. The only other such references, as much Jewish as Christian, which I have encountered in Late Latin grammars are a note on the word *pascha* in the fifth-century author Pompeius (V 177, 4), and the word *sabbata* in the grammar attributed to Scaurus (f. 55v)” (Law: 1984: 173 n. 64). According to the *CGL* database (which naturally post-dates Law’s article), the word *sabbata* (‘sabbath’) occurs in the *Institutiones* of Priscian (*GL* 2: 46, 7)¹³⁴ and in the *Appendix* of Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 196, 3)¹³⁵ in addition to the *APS* (IX, 80). The word *pascha* (‘Easter’ or ‘Passover’) appears in the *Appendix Probi* (*GL* 4: 195, 19) as well as the commentary of Pompey. The presence of the word *sabbata* need not necessarily point to a late dating in fifth or sixth century AD, the date for Pompey or Priscian, as *sabbata* appears also in works by authors of the first century BC, such as Horace (*S.* 1.9.69) and Ovid (*Rem.* 220), as well as those of the Silver Age, like Persius (5.179) and Juvenal (6.153; 14.96). But naturally many more instances of *sabbata* occur in Christian writings from Tertullian (late second century AD) onward.

In Law’s 1984 article we can find also other useful points in considering the dating of the *APS*. As Law writes on the *Ars breuiata*, it “is indisputably a work of late Antiquity, as is suggested by the fact that it names no other ancient grammarians and draws directly upon the common stock of late Antique pedagogical material. (Early medieval grammarians, with rare exceptions, no longer had access to this material except through the works of those ancient grammarians which survive to the present day; a source analysis of later works will therefore normally be able to trace virtually all their doctrine to one or another of the extant ancient works)” (1984: 172). This is true also of the *APS*: its doctrine is indeed derived from the “common stock of late Antique pedagogical material” not from other extant ancient works. While the material in the *APS* often has parallels in other extant Late Latin grammars, some sections in the *APS* do not have any corresponding passages in the corpus of Late Latin grammars. Also, while the *APS* does name Varro (and, perhaps, Valerius Probus),¹³⁶ no other grammarians are referred to in the text;¹³⁷ this may also speak for an earlier dating.¹³⁸ The same applies to the fact that the *APS* does not draw directly upon Donatus’ works, which saw rapid success and, according to Law (1984: 172), were used by all grammarians from the fifth century onward.

¹³⁴ *GL* 2: 46, 7: “*Sabburra, sabbata, gibbus, gibberosus, gibber, obba.*”

¹³⁵ *GL* 4: 196, 2–3: “*nomina generis neutri semper pluralis numeri: arma is, bucolica is, moenia bus, mapalia bus, sabbata is, missa is, castra is, georgica is, magalia bus ...*”.

¹³⁶ See chapter 3.9, p. 183.

¹³⁷ With the exception of the example where the name Scaurus occurs (X, 4–5).

¹³⁸ Cf. Law (1984: 172 n. 62): “In general, later grammarians tend to cite more of their grammatical authorities by name than earlier ones. Donatus mentions none at all, whereas Servius and Priscian, for example, refer relatively frequently to their grammatical sources.”

Thus far, most of the internal evidence seems to speak for a dating that precedes the end of the fourth century. In her 1987 article, Law suggests that the date of the *APS*, as regards the internal features of the text, falls between the last third of the first century AD and the middle of the fourth century (1987: 83). As already pointed out in my article on the attribution of the *APS* (2008: 155–156), the *terminus post quem* of late first century AD has to be postponed on the basis of the presence of material that is first attested in Latin grammars only in the late third to early fourth century AD.

This material is comprised of, for instance, the essential definition of the noun as well as the semantic subcategories of the noun. These aspects appear in Late Latin grammars in the late third to mid-fourth century AD, but their origin can be traced a couple of centuries back, to Apollonius Dyscolus. According to Luhtala (2005: 152), there is not much evidence for the presence of philosophical concepts in grammar before the time of Apollonius Dyscolus. He is the first (extant) grammarian to use philosophical concepts in a way that recalls their use by later grammarians: for instance, the philosophical definitions of the noun and the verb (as signifying substance and quality, and action and undergoing action, respectively) (Luhtala 2005: 152). However, when we examine the content of the Latin grammars of the third to fourth centuries AD, it is clear that the doctrine of Apollonius has been subject to reworking under a Platonist interpretation (Luhtala 2005: 151; 2010: 234–237). Luhtala (2010: 235–236) sees this possibly taking place in the Neoplatonic circles in Rome, where there was renewed interest in philosophy among grammarians in the third and fourth centuries AD.¹³⁹

In addition to the essential definitions that begin to appear in Latin grammars in the late third to early fourth century, also the semantic subtypes of the noun are probably a relatively recent addition to Late Antique grammars. According to Luhtala (2010: 222), the subtypes of common nouns, containing both semantic and formal types, are for the first time integrated into a coherent system in the *Ars maior* of Donatus. Other grammars of the fourth century show signs of disorganization in their treatment of these subtypes, as evidenced by the grammars of Ps.-Probus and Charisius, for instance.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ See, for example, Luhtala 2010: 236: “It could be argued that it is within the Neoplatonic circles in Rome in the third and fourth centuries that the philosophical apparatus of grammar came to perfection, and the definitions of the parts of speech of the Latin *Schulgrammatik* were cast into the form of substantial definitions. (Apollonius’ works were in all likelihood available in Rome, since his son Herodian was active there.) It is indeed in the late third century that the substantial definition is first attested in Latin grammar, and this is in all likelihood the time when the new standard definition of the noun, as signifying *corpus* or *res*, began to circulate, although it is first attested in the early fourth century.”

¹⁴⁰ See Luhtala (2010: 233 n. 56): “Pseudo-Probus’ account of the noun invites comparison with Charisius’ grammar, in which the subtypes of common nouns are not integrated into the structure of the section on the noun. After the

Whereas in Donatus' *Ars maior* these developments can be seen in full, the situation regarding the *APS* is slightly different. The definitions in the *APS* all adhere to the pattern of the essential definition (cf. *nomen est pars orationis...*), but not all of them show signs of fully adopting the renovations that originate in Apollonius Dyscolus' works. In the *APS*, the noun does signify concrete objects or abstract things (properly or commonly) as in Donatus' works, but the verb is not defined as a part of speech signifying action or undergoing action, as in, for example, the grammars of Donatus and Sacerdos. Rather, it is defined in terms of its formal features alone, "*Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu*" (XI, 3),¹⁴¹ as in, for example, Diomedes' and Augustine's grammars. Also, the definition of the pronoun in the *APS* lacks a reference to (definite) person, as in, for instance, Charisius' and Augustine's works. This is in contrast to the definitions appearing in the grammars of Donatus and Priscian. According to Luhtala, definite person is "crucial for Apollonius' understanding of the pronoun" (2005: 140).

As regards the semantic subcategories of the noun, the *APS* also shows signs of confusion. This is quite common in the grammars of the fourth century, as, for instance, Charisius and Ps.-Probus struggle with integrating this material into the discussion on the noun (see n. 140 above). While Donatus lists all the subtypes under the *qualitas* of the noun, the *APS* begins in a similar way, but instead of listing all the subtypes at once, the author first enumerates four subtypes (IX, 15–16), then adds another three types without any explanation (IX, 21–27) before moving on to discuss comparison (IX 28–63). After a long digression on comparison, the author of the *APS* again lists five subtypes of common nouns (IX, 64–66). Then he discusses some of the properties (*accidentia*) of the noun, namely gender (*genus*), number (*numerus*), and composition (*figura*), before adding the final subtypes of common nouns, which appear mixed with types of proper nouns (IX, 94–96). The result is hardly a systematic presentation and frankly makes one wonder whether some confusion has occurred in the transmission of the text. However, when one considers the various attempts to tackle this issue by grammarians of the fourth century, the treatment in the *APS* fits into the picture very well.

As the *APS* has only partially adopted the renovated material and struggles to integrate some of it, we could suggest that the text pre-dates Donatus' works, which show full integration of the new material. Thus the *APS* would share an early fourth century dating with, for instance, the

definition of the noun, Charisius proceeds to discuss the distinction between proper and common nouns, dividing the latter into two, those signifying corporeal things, those signifying incorporeal things. Immediately afterwards, he lists the accidents of the noun, quality, genus, figure, number and case, and states that quality is that by which we understand whether the noun is proper or common. This exhausts the treatment of *qualitas*, and he moves on to discuss gender, composition, number, and case. It is only then, that he lists under no specific title the twenty-four subtypes of common nouns that were discussed by Donatus in an orderly manner within the *qualitas* of the noun (GL 1.143.21–156.19)."

¹⁴¹ "The verb is a part of speech with a tense and person but without a case."

Instituta artium of Ps.-Probus. The situation is not, however, so straightforward as that: the grammars of Charisius (c. 362 AD), Diomedes (c. 370–380 AD), and Augustine (386–387 AD) all post-date those of Donatus (c. 350 AD), but still fail to include some or all of the new features.¹⁴² A dating in the earlier part of the fourth century for the *APS* still seems likely, judging from, for instance, the similarities the text shares with another grammar of that period, the grammar of Cominianus (c. 330AD), one of the sources of Charisius (see the discussion in the chapter 1.4).

A few more points need to be considered with regard to the issue of dating the *APS*. The grammar lacks any mention of declensions for nouns. The editor of the *Regulae* of Ps.-Palaemon suggests that this could be an archaic trait (Rosellini 2001: xlvii n. 46).¹⁴³ This does not automatically indicate a very early dating, as Donatus' grammars also fail to mention the declensions, only giving the rule for deducing the plural genitive, dative, and ablative forms from the ablative singular form, similarly to the *APS* (IX, 139ff.).

Also the absence of all paradigms seems to indicate that the intended audience of the work was probably comprised of native speakers of the Latin language (cf. Rosellini 2001: xlviii). In its almost complete lack of paradigms the *APS* resembles the *Ars maior* of Donatus. Judging from the scope of the work, the *APS* seems to have been intended for use similar to that of the *Ars maior*, in schools; certainly, the relatively brief *APS* is by no means a scholar's reference work. The slightly wider scope of the work as compared to, for instance, the *Ars minor*, and the lack of mnemonic tools like the question-and-answer form or the enumeration of every aspect of the doctrine,¹⁴⁴ point to the *APS* being probably intended for pupils somewhat advanced in their studies.

¹⁴² In fact, Luhtala gives Augustine's *Ars breviata* as an example of a Late Antique grammar not influenced by the post-Apollonian renovation of grammar. See Luhtala (2005: 138–141) for a detailed discussion.

¹⁴³ Rosellini 2001: (xlvii n. 46) "Questo è un tratto di arcaicità che non si sarebbe potuto rilevare dal testo pubblicato dal Keil perché il revisore di μ aveva invece introdotto questa terminologia (...). Neanche le *Regulae Augustini* adottano la distinzione in quattro o cinque declinazioni."

¹⁴⁴ The *APS* does occasionally enumerate aspects of its doctrine, such as the number of vowels and consonants, the number of cases (in nouns), and so on. Both the *Ars maior* and, particularly, the *Ars minor* are, however, much more conscientious in enumerating the doctrine they present, enumerating, for instance, also the *accidentia* of the parts of speech.

1.4 The Sources of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* and its Reception

As argued in chapter 1.3, the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* belongs most likely to the earlier half of the fourth century. It is not dependent on Donatus' works; nor does it include all the renovations that appear in Donatus' *Ars maior* (c. 350 AD) for the first time in Latin grammars. A dating in the earlier part of the fourth century AD means that the *APS* cannot be directly dependent on most of the extant Late Latin grammars, as the majority of them post-date the mid-fourth century AD, belonging to the period at the end of the fourth century or the fifth or even early sixth century.¹⁴⁵

This state of affairs, which affects also other Late Antique grammars,¹⁴⁶ prevents us from finding direct sources for the *APS* and limits us, in the source apparatus, to signalling parallel passages preserved in other grammatical texts that might depend on the same source or sources.¹⁴⁷ When we examine the *APS*, it becomes clear that the text shares more similarities with what Barwick (1922: *passim*) termed "Charisius-Gruppe" than with Donatus' works.¹⁴⁸ In addition to sharing source material with the Charisius group, the grammar of Diomedes also has some ties to the *APS*, which are most likely distinct from his use of Charisius' grammar or its source.¹⁴⁹ Also the grammar of Victorinus and the *Excerpta* of Audax¹⁵⁰ share a certain amount of similarity with the *APS*, and their connection with the text is also addressed below. However, the relationship of the *APS* with (mostly) the second book of the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius, a fairly late text,¹⁵¹ is relatively clear: the compiler of that work¹⁵² used the *APS* in composing his work, and he knew the *APS* as the work of one Scaurus.

Naturally, the ties between extant Latin grammars have been examined in numerous works to date. No universal agreement exists, however, as to the situation concerning the lost sources of Late

¹⁴⁵ In Law's (2003: 66) list of *Schulgrammatik*-type grammars (the type of grammar to contain the most similarities with the *APS*), only Scaurus (that is, the *APS*), Asper (or Ps.-Asper), Sacerdos, Probus (or Ps.-Probus), and Victorinus are considered to pre-date 350 AD. Also the grammar of Cominianus, only partly preserved in Charisius' grammar, most likely pre-dates the mid-fourth century AD.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. the discussion on the *Ars breuiata* by Law (1984: 172).

¹⁴⁷ The apparatus will thus signal *loci similes*, most of which post-date the *APS*. See chapter 1.5 below.

¹⁴⁸ Although in its scope and content the *APS* is closer to the works of Donatus than those of Charisius, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, or Dositheus.

¹⁴⁹ I do not refer to the quotations from Scaurus that appear in Diomedes' grammar. These quotations, which refer most likely to the second century AD grammarian, were discussed in chapter 1.2. Law (1987: 75–80, 86–88) considered the doctrine attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes as originating from another (more extensive) work by Q. Terentius Scaurus (as it did not coincide with the text she had discovered, M [sc. the *APS*]), but she pointed out also other similarities between Diomedes' work and the *APS*, not attributed by Diomedes to any specific grammarian, which further complicate the matter (cf., e.g., the definition of *elementum* and *ars*, or the doctrine on *littera*). See p. 38 below.

¹⁵⁰ Law (2003: 66) gives a late fourth century dating for this work.

¹⁵¹ On the dating of this work, see p. 22 and p. 22 n. 128 & 129 above.

¹⁵² See De Paolis (2000: *passim*) for discussion on the problems concerning the composition of the *Explanationes*.

Antique Latin grammars and their exact relationships.¹⁵³ Therefore it is not possible in my study to rely on a fully-fashioned model regarding the sources used by, for instance, Charisius or Diomedes. Many studies certainly help in my task of trying to identify some the sources of the *APS*. However, the recent developments with reference to the authenticity of the grammar of Dionysius Thrax and the origins of Latin grammar or views concerning the timeframe of the development of the language science in Antiquity, among other things, are not taken into account in most of these studies. This obviously complicates matters for me.

In his monograph on the grammar of Diomedes, Raphael Dammer surveys the source studies of the major grammarians, particularly as regards Diomedes (2001: 26–30). He briefly presents the views of Kummrow, Jeep, and Barwick. According to Dammer, Kummrow explains the majority of the similarities between extant grammars as a result of using the same sources; he saw the grammarians as having worked independently from each other (for example, Diomedes did not know Donatus or Charisius directly, but used the same sources as they did, e.g., Palaemon, Scaurus, and Cominianus) (2001: 26). Kummrow does not consider Audax to have used the *ars* of (Q. Terentius) Scaurus, regardless of the title of his work: *Audacis excerpta de Scauro et Palladio* (Kummrow 1880: 8).¹⁵⁴ Jeep, on the other hand, thinks that Audax and Victorinus drew from a certain Scaurus (referred to in the name of Audax's work). According to Dammer, Jeep regards the similarities between extant grammars as arising from direct use: Diomedes used the grammars of Donatus and Charisius directly, as well as also, most probably, Charisius' source (Dammer 2001: 27). In his influential 1922 study, Karl Barwick sought to arrive at an understanding of an even earlier stage of Roman grammar by arguing that Latin grammar (also in Late Antiquity) was shaped by the material and the framework taken over from Greek *techne grammatike* as well as the widely circulated *ars grammatica* of Remmius Palaemon (first century AD).¹⁵⁵ Thus there were no significant developments in the three centuries after Palaemon in Latin language science (Barwick 1922: 241–242). In Barwick's model the grammar of a later Scaurus accounts for the similarities between the grammars of Audax and Victorinus (Barwick 1922: 86–87).¹⁵⁶ Barwick argues that the

¹⁵³ Cf. Dammer (2001: 26): "Freilich waren und sind die Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse unter den Texten der lateinischen Grammatiker unsicher und umstritten."

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Kummrow (1880: 8): "*quod vero Audax se Scauri et Palladii libros excerpisse inscriptione libri testatur, hoc nullius est momenti. nam sicut Keilius Gr. lat. VII, 319 Palladii nomine instituta artium Probi significari probabiliter conicit, Scauri quoque nomine non confidere iam per se aequum est.*"

¹⁵⁵ But also Varro had, according to Barwick, an influence on Latin grammar, especially as regards morphology (Barwick 1922: 241–242).

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Barwick (1922: 87): "Es kann daher kaum bezweifelt werden, daß der vom Verfasser der Explanationen und der in der inscriptio bei Aud. genannte Scaurus ein und dieselbe Person sind, daß also die gemeinsame Quelle des Aud.-Max.Vict. unter dem Namen eines gewissen Scaurus ging. Dieser Scaurus hat natürlich nichts zu tun mit dem berühmten älteren Grammatiker. Es muß, wenn kein Irrtum der Überlieferung vorliegt, einen jüngeren Grammatiker

grammar of the teacher of Charisius, the so-called Gewährsmann of the Charisius group, was used by Dositheus, the author of the *Ars Bobiensis*, as well as Charisius. Diomedes would have used the grammar of Charisius as one of his sources, but in a form that differs from the text we have today (Dammer 2001: 28–29). Later studies, such as those by Holtz (1981) or Schmidt (1989, 1997), have abandoned some of Barwick’s hypotheses, but considering the recent developments in the study of ancient linguistics more work regarding the relationships between the extant Latin grammars remains to be done.

Louis Holtz’s extensive study on Donatus’ grammars and their structure, context, and reception contains some points that bear on my endeavour to find out about the sources of the *APS*. Holtz divides the main extant Late Latin grammars into five groups (partially on lines similar to Barwick); the groups are exemplified by the grammar of Sacerdos, Cominianus, Charisius, Audax/Victorinus, and Donatus (1981: 81–82). As in Barwick’s model, the Charisius group is united by its ultimate source, an anonymous *Schulgrammatik*-type text (“grammaire scolaire”) used by Charisius’ teacher in his compilation. Parts of this lost work would then appear in Charisius’, Diomedes’, and Dositheus’ grammars, the *Ars Bobiensis*, the *ars grammatica* of Marius Victorinus, as well as the second book of the *Explanations* (Holtz 1981: 81).¹⁵⁷ According to Holtz (1981: 82), the Audax/Victorinus group would be based on a refashioned grammar in a question-and-answer form by a certain Palladius (the first third of the fourth century). Holtz thinks that both Victorinus and Audax belong to an era after the fourth century (1981: 82 n. 35).¹⁵⁸

P. L. Schmidt’s article in the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* (vol. 5) was published in 1989, two years after the publication of Vivien Law’s article in which the information of this new textual discovery was made available to the scholarly community. Although Law had preferred to think of her finding as the *Ars minor* of Q. Terentius Scaurus, she had also voiced the possibility of its being a later epitome of Q. Terentius Scaurus’ work (1987: 86, 88). In his article on grammar and rhetoric in Late Antiquity,¹⁵⁹ Schmidt seems to prefer the second of Law’s hypotheses: that is to say that the text would be a later epitome of Q. Terentius Scaurus’ work, or “ein frühes spätantikes ‘Breviarium de breviario’”, as he calls it (1989: 108).¹⁶⁰ Schmidt refers to

dieses Namens gegeben haben. An sich steht dem nichts im Wege: wie einen jüngeren Probus, ebensogut kann es einen jüngeren Scaurus gegeben haben.”

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Barwick (1922: 68): “Auch von dem Verfasser der expl. in Don. läßt sich nachweisen, daß er den Gewährsmann der Char.-Gruppe benutzt hat.”

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Holtz (1981: 82 n. 35): “Quant à Audax, il a connu l’*Ars Donati* (cf. *Aud.* 359, 14).” Law (2003: 66) gives an “early fourth century” dating for Victorinus and a “late fourth century” dating for Audax. Kaster gives a rather vague dating of “before s. VII; after s. IV 1/2” for Audax and a dating of mid-fourth century for Victorinus (Kaster 1988: 386, 437).

¹⁵⁹ The scope of volume 5 of the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* is 284–374 AD.

¹⁶⁰ See also n. 35 above.

Law's finding as a "Scaurus-Auszug", a Scaurus excerpt or epitome, and believes it to contain much of the doctrine of the second century AD grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus (1989: 108–109). The same applies to the text represented by the grammars of Audax and Victorinus ("eine zweite Scaurus-Epitome") (1989: 109).¹⁶¹ Schmidt also regards these two Scaurus epitomes to be among the first representatives of the short, one-book elementary grammar in Late Antiquity,¹⁶² along with another text, the first book of Sacerdos' *ars grammatica* (1989: 109, 112–113).

I do not know whether Schmidt consulted the unpublished text of the *APS* or whether he relied only on Law's views in writing his articles for the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*. Nevertheless, his study is not very helpful as regards my task, as only Q. Terentius Scaurus is identified as a source for the *APS*. As already argued in chapter 1.2 above, I do not consider the *APS* to represent the doctrine of the second century grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus.

Although there are some noticeable similarities in the *APS*, Victorinus' grammar, and the *Excerpta* of Audax,¹⁶³ it would be difficult to consider these three grammars as representing the doctrine of one grammarian, who, according to Schmidt, would be Q. Terentius Scaurus. There is great variation in the structure and scope of these grammars.¹⁶⁴ For instance, in the grammar of Victorinus, the systematic treatment of the subject matter that characterizes the *APS* is lacking: certain parts of speech are not discussed at all or are presented in an imperfect manner.¹⁶⁵ As regards the definitions used in these three grammars, there is little uniformity. If Q. Terentius Scaurus' grammar was the main source for these three texts, which of the varying definitions would go back to his *ars grammatica* and which would not?¹⁶⁶ The only definition that is similar almost to

¹⁶¹ Schmidt believes the influence of Q. Terentius Scaurus on Latin grammar to have been considerable up to the fourth century (1997: 223). Although his grammar in several books, comprehending discussions of the preliminary material, the parts of speech, as well as stylistics, has been lost, Schmidt believes that some of his doctrine has come down to us in excerpts, (papyrus)fragments, and quotations (1997: 223–224). The *APS* is regarded by Schmidt as a "kürzeren, aber originaleren Fassung"; thus much of its content would, accordingly, be traceable to Q. Terentius Scaurus (1997: 224).

¹⁶² Cf. (1989: 109): "Scaurus I [sc. the *APS*] und II [sc. Victorinus-Audax] also stellen (mitsamt dem 1. Buch des Sacerdos, § 522.3) die ersten spätantiken Vertreter der einbändigen Schulgrammatik (Holtz: 'manuel bref') dar."

¹⁶³ Cf., for example, the following passages: *APS* I, 5–6 = Vict. *GL* 6: 188, 1–2 = Aud. *GL* 7: 321, 6–7; *APS* VII, 3 = Vict. *GL* 6: 188, 25–26 = Aud. *GL* 7: 324, 2–3; *APS* XIII, 4–5 = Vict. *GL* 6: 201, 15–18 = Aud. *GL* 7: 347, 24–27; *APS* XIV, 32–33 = Vict. *GL* 6: 204, 15–16 ≈ Aud. *GL* 7: 354, 21–23.

¹⁶⁴ According to Schmidt, Scaurus' *ars grammatica* consists of "die traditionelle Trias, Grundbegriffe, Wortarten und (poetische) Stilistik (Redefiguren)" (1997: 224). However, these three 'Scaurus epitomes' do not possess a section on stylistics (except for a brief chapter on *barbarismus* in Audax's grammar (*GL* 7: 361, 13–362, 21)).

¹⁶⁵ Victorinus' grammar lacks the chapters on *nomen* and *pronomen*, although Barwick thinks that this is probably due to later interference (1922: 82 n. 1). In the chapter on the participle, only participles similar to nouns (of the type *passus*) and nouns resembling participles (such as *comatus*) are discussed; the definition and the *accidentia* of the participle are lacking. Also Audax's grammar seems defective; for the most part, his chapter on the noun consists of a discussion on case, which appears also in Victorinus' work under the title *de casibus*. Other matters pertaining to *nomen* span only six lines of text. Audax's treatment of the participle contains only an etymological definition and a discussion on the final syllables of the participle.

¹⁶⁶ That is, if we hypothetically would not take into account the fact that most of the definitions appearing in these works (other than the etymological definitions, cf. Audax *GL* 7: 348, 32–349, 2) belong to a later period than the second

the word in all three grammars is that of the conjunction.¹⁶⁷ Also, no trace of the genuine doctrine of Q. Terentius Scaurus appears in any of these three texts; for example, the definitions of the adverb appearing in these grammars are nothing like the one attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes (*GL 1*: 403, 20–21).¹⁶⁸ Similarly, Scaurus' division of the nominal parts of speech into three (*nomen*, *appellatio*, *uocabulum*) and the definitions he gives for them (*GL 1*: 320, 13–24) are not echoed in any way in the grammars of Audax and Victorinus or the *APS*. In conclusion, even if some of the doctrine in these three texts, which according to Schmidt represents the doctrine of Q. Terentius Scaurus, ultimately belonged to the second-century grammarian, it would be all but impossible to trace, as only fragments of his grammar are available to us for comparison. I feel that, based on the little that remains, the *APS*, at least, does not contain material that can reliably be tied to the renowned grammarian of the era of Hadrian.¹⁶⁹

As I put forward in the previous paragraphs, the similarities between the three aforementioned texts, the *APS*, the grammar of Victorinus, and the *Excerpta* of Audax, cannot be explained by a common source in the works of the second-century grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus. Due to the very limited number of Latin grammars pre-dating the fourth century, it is extremely difficult to identify sources for grammars of the fourth century with any certainty. Thus, I cannot offer an alternative source in place of Q. Terentius Scaurus that would account in a comprehensive manner for the structure and content of the *APS*. For, if we were dealing with an epitome of Scaurus' extensive grammar, presumably almost every point of doctrine in the *APS* would have its origin in that grammarian's work.¹⁷⁰ However, as this is not the case, we must settle for searching parallel

century AD. Also, Victorinus only gives a definition for four of the eight parts of speech: the adverb, the conjunction, the preposition, and the interjection. Should we then attribute these omissions to Victorinus' inconsistent use of his presumably systematically organized source?

¹⁶⁷ Cf. *APS* XV, 3 = Vict. *GL 6*: 202, 21 = Aud. *GL 7*: 349, 10–11. Almost nothing of the relationships between the three texts can be said based on this similarity, as the definition of the conjunction had the widest circulation of all the Late Antique standard definitions, "occurring in essentially the same form in all grammars from the 3rd and 4th centuries" (Luhtala 2002: 279).

¹⁶⁸ *GL 1*: 403, 20–21: "Scaurus ita definit, aduerbium est modus rei dictionis ipsa pronuntiatione definitus, <ut> recte diligenter optime." Cf. the definition appearing in the grammar of Audax (*GL 7*: 347, 23–24): "quid est aduerbium? pars orationis, qua adiecta uerbo manifestior oratio redditur, ut docte dixit, pulchre fecit, bene scripsit" ≈ Victorinus (*GL 6*: 201, 14–15). Also the definition appearing in the *APS* (XIII, 3) is different to the one quoted by Diomedes.

¹⁶⁹ My acquaintance as regards the grammar of Victorinus and the *Excerpta* of Audax is not very extensive. Still, note, for instance, the discrepancy between the definition of *oratio* attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes (*GL 1*: 300, 19–20), "*Scaurus sic, oratio est ore missa et per dictiones ordinata pronuntiatio*", and the definition of *oratio* appearing in the *APS* (VIII, 3), "*Oratio est significantibus uocibus secundum rationem ordinata sententia*". It is also noteworthy that the definition of *oratio* occurring in the grammar of Victorinus (*GL 6*: 192, 2–6), "*Oratio quid est? Contextus sermo ad clausulam tendens. Vnde dicta oratio? Quasi oris ratio. De clausula. Clausula quid est? Compositio verborum plausibilis structurae exitu terminata*" (≈ Audax, *GL 7*: 324, 8–11), and another definition occurring in Diomedes' grammar (*GL 1*: 300, 22–24), but not attributed to any grammarian, coincide: "*oratio est sermo contextus ad clausulam tendens. clausula est compositio verborum plausibilis structurae exitu terminata*."

¹⁷⁰ In his discussion on the Scaurus epitomes (the *APS*/Audax-Victorinus), Schmidt refers to the practice of epitomising authoritative works, for example, Livius, in Late Antiquity (1989: 101, 109). This suggests that the content of the

passages in the extant Late Latin grammars, and try to draw some conclusions based on our findings.

There are two types of parallel passage between the *APS* and the grammars of Victorinus and Audax: those that they share with a number of other grammars including the *APS*, and those that only appear in the *APS* and the two grammars. I first discuss the latter type of parallel passage, which are fewer. In fact, as Victorinus and the *APS* share some passages not included in the grammar of Audax or any other grammar, I feel I can most likely exclude Audax's grammar from the discussion. The similarities between the *APS* and Audax are thus to be understood as due to Audax's ties with Victorinus' grammar or, perhaps, its source.¹⁷¹

A passage in the *APS* (III, 18–20), toward the end of the discussion on *litterae*, appears also in the discussion on letters in the grammar of Victorinus (*GL* 6: 196, 12–17),¹⁷² albeit in a slightly altered form. However, the number of the final letters in Latin nouns mentioned in the two discussions is the same, 13, as are the examples quoted and the position of the passage in the chapter on *litterae*. Many other grammars give this information in another context (see the commentary in chapter 3.3).¹⁷³

In the chapter on the adverb (XIII, 21–23), a mention of decorative or ornamental adverbs (*aduerbia ornatia*) occurs in the *APS*. This passage is echoed in Victorinus' work (*GL* 6: 202, 5–10).¹⁷⁴ The fact that these adverbs are only mentioned in these two grammars and that the wordings in the two passages are close to each other speaks for a link of some kind between these two texts.

At the end of the chapter on the preposition in the *APS* (XIV, 32–33), the pronunciation of the prepositions (or prefixes) *in-* and *con-* is discussed. These lines are paralleled in the grammar of Victorinus (*GL* 6: 204, 15–16). Although this issue is highlighted also in other passages in the extant Latin grammars, the two aforementioned treatments are most likely connected with each

epitome would be for the most part traceable to the original work (in this case the *Ars grammatica* of Q. Terentius Scaurus).

¹⁷¹ The only time Audax's work contains material that Victorinus' grammar does not have (with reference to the content of the *APS*) is at *GL* 7: 321, 7–9 (“ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων, id est a litteris, cui nomen latinum a quibusdam litteratura vel litteralitas datum est”), where Victorinus (*GL* 6: 188, 2–3) has “dicta autem ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων, [id est ab his litteris].” But this case is most likely due to an omission (cf. the part Keil has excluded), and, in any case, this passage is not exactly identical to the *APS* (I, 6–7). Cf. also the Virgil quotation (*Aen.* 10.841) which appears in Audax (*GL* 7: 355, 22) and at XIV, 25–26 in the *APS* (although in a slightly longer form than in Audax's grammar). The context of the quotation is similar in the two grammars, but not identical, so a direct link between the passages can in my opinion be ruled out. Kaster thinks that the resemblance between Audax and Victorinus is due to a common source rather than direct dependence (1988: 386).

¹⁷² Cf. *GL* 6: 196, 12–17 and Audax, *GL* 7: 327, 8–13.

¹⁷³ Also Donatus includes a similar discussion in the chapter on *nomen*, but the content is slightly different as is the context of the passage (cf. the commentary on *De litteris* in chapter 3.3).

¹⁷⁴ See also *GL* 4: 558, 19–23 in the *Explanationes*. However, this instance must be due to the fact that the *APS* was the source for the passage in the *Explanationes*.

other.¹⁷⁵ The other instances where this point of doctrine is discussed have a clearly different wording and content.¹⁷⁶

Finally, in the chapter on the interjection (XVI, 7–10), the author of the *APS* discusses other parts of speech used as interjections. Other than the *Explanaciones* (*GL* 4: 562, 22–25), only the grammar of Victorinus (*GL* 6: 204, 25–205, 1) contains a similar discussion with regard to its wording and the literary quotations used to illuminate the issue.¹⁷⁷ In the light of these similarities, which mostly only appear in the *APS* and the grammar of Victorinus,¹⁷⁸ could the *APS* then be the source for the passages appearing in the grammar of Victorinus? In my opinion this is probably not the case. Chronologically, it might just be possible, as both works are most likely of the first half of the fourth century.¹⁷⁹ However, when compared to the direct use of the *APS* in the *Explanaciones*, the parallel passages in Victorinus’ grammar are not as close as most of those that appear in the *Explanaciones*. I do not refer only to the fact that some of the parallel passages have been rewritten into a question-and-answer form in Victorinus’ grammar,¹⁸⁰ but rather to more substantial differences in wording or content.¹⁸¹ The *APS* and the grammar of Victorinus probably share a source that accounts for the similar content, but direct dependence is not very likely.¹⁸² Certainly, it can now be ruled out in any case that the *APS* is identical to the “Gewährsmann des Aud.-Max.Vict.” (Barwick 1922: 86), that is, the Scaurus referred to in the title of Audax’s work, *De Scauri et Palladii libris excerpta per interrogationem et responsionem*.

¹⁷⁵ Although the fact that this passage is rather corrupt in the *APS* (see the commentary on *De praepositione*, chapter 3.11) does complicate the matter.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. the passage in Donatus’ *Ars maior* (648, 14–649, 1H), which agrees with a passage in Diomedes (*GL* 1: 409, 2–4). Another version of this discussion in Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta artium* (*GL* 4: 149, 31–33) is echoed in the grammar of Audax (*GL* 7: 354, 21–23).

¹⁷⁷ Other discussions on this particular subject can be found in, for instance, Diomedes’ work, which even has some of the same examples as the *APS* (*GL* 1: 419, 14–16: “*etiam aliae partes orationis pro interiectione singulae pluresve ponuntur, ut est o mi, ellum, amabo, nefas, pro nefas, malum, miserum, infandum*”), and Donatus (652, 10–11H).

¹⁷⁸ Some of the passages also appear in the *Explanaciones* (due to the *APS* being one of its sources) and the grammar of Audax, which in turn is probably connected to the grammar of Victorinus, not the *APS*.

¹⁷⁹ Law gives the dating as “early fourth century” (2003: 66). Also Mariotti thinks that the beginning of the fourth century is a probable dating for this grammar (1967: 46). The question whether *Ars Victorini* is the work of Marius Victorinus or not is open. Mariotti (1967: 46) thinks that this is not the case. See Schmidt (1989:111) for more views.

¹⁸⁰ See, e.g., *GL* 6: 196, 12–17 and *GL* 6: 202, 5–10.

¹⁸¹ Compare *GL* 6: 204, 15–16: “*in et con aliquando corripuntur...*” with “*In et con syllabae ... <sequentibus> ceteris omnibus corripuntur*” (XIV, 32–33). Cf. also the omission of Virgil’s name by Victorinus at *GL* 6: 204, 24 as well as the fact that where both the *APS* and *Explanaciones* have “*nefas hic enim interiectio est*” Victorinus’ grammar has “*in utroque enim interiectio est exclamantis*” (*GL* 6: 204, 25–26).

¹⁸² If the mention of Donatus in the grammar of Victorinus (*GL* 6: 200, 24) is an interpolation, as Barwick (1922: 82 n. 1) thinks it is, chronologically it might just be possible for Victorinus to be a source for the *APS*. However, the differences between the parallel passages in the two works and their overall structure speak against direct dependence.

The similarities between the *APS* and the grammars that Karl Barwick calls the Charisius group¹⁸³ are notable, and they can be seen in most chapters of the *APS*. Still, the text of the *APS* also contains passages that cannot be traced to the grammars of the Charisius group or to any other extant grammar, or passages where the doctrine presented in the *APS* clashes with the doctrine occurring in, for instance, the grammar of Charisius.¹⁸⁴ Therefore I would hesitate to consider the *APS* as part of that group of texts in the same way as Dositheus' grammar or the *Ars Bobiensis*.

Chronologically speaking, neither the grammar of Charisius, the *ars grammatica* of Dositheus, nor the *Ars Bobiensis* can comfortably be a source for the author of the *APS*. However, an earlier grammarian who Charisius quotes in his work, possibly also his teacher, Cominianus, wrote his grammar perhaps around 330 AD,¹⁸⁵ and this grammar could thus possibly be considered a source of the similarities between the *APS* and the grammars of the Charisius group. Many passages in the *APS* also agree almost to the word with what Charisius attributes to Cominianus in his grammar.¹⁸⁶ What is problematic here is that, while Charisius quotes his sources by name relatively often,¹⁸⁷ we cannot always know for certain what belongs to the grammar of Cominianus when Charisius does not happen to name his source.¹⁸⁸ Even without this particular problem, we still face another one: some of the parallel passages between the *APS* and the grammars of the Charisius group occur in sections not appearing in Charisius' work at all, but rather in Dositheus' grammar or the *Ars Bobiensis*.¹⁸⁹ At least some of these problems could, perhaps, be solved if we considered Cominianus to be the author of not only the passages attributed directly to him by Charisius but also others occurring in the grammar of Charisius (or the grammar of Dositheus or the *Ars Bobiensis*) – in other words, if we can identify Cominianus as the so-called Gewährsmann of the Charisius group. This is, in fact, what some scholars think. Unlike Barwick (1922: 27ff., 63ff.), and despite the fact that what is directly attributed to Cominianus presents a very elementary

¹⁸³ The so-called Charisius group contains the grammars of Charisius and Dositheus as well as the *Ars Bobiensis*, with Diomedes' grammar sometimes showing strong similarities with these three texts and at other times with another source (such as Donatus or his source).

¹⁸⁴ Cf. the definition of *oratio* (VIII, 3), for instance, with the definition appearing in Charisius' grammar (193, 4–5B). See chapter 3.5, p. 104 n. 27). The doctrine on *uox* (II, *passim*) in the *APS* is in part unique to this grammar. See chapter 3.2 below, for a full discussion.

¹⁸⁵ See Schmidt (1989: 123).

¹⁸⁶ Cf., for example, XI, 37–44 (225, 25–226, 5B), XIII, 4–5 (233, 2–6B), XVI, 3–6 (311, 5–8B). Usually these parallel passages are not, however, unique to these two authors (that is, the author of the *APS* and Cominianus).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Law (1987: 79; 79 n. 34).

¹⁸⁸ Cf., for instance, the article by Bonnet (2000: *passim*), in which he tries to identify the passage (or passages) on verbal voice in Charisius' grammar which should be attributed to Cominianus.

¹⁸⁹ For instance, the passage at XI, 31–32 agrees almost to the letter with the *Ars Bobiensis* (49, 18–19D), while the corresponding passage in Charisius' grammar is not nearly so close in its wording. Compare the passage in the *APS*, “*Personae in uerbis sunt tres: prima a qua sermo est, ut 'scribo', secunda ad quam sermo est, ut 'scribis', tertia de qua sermo est, ut 'scribit'*”, with the one occurring in the *Ars Bobiensis* (49, 18–19D), “*Personae, sunt tres: prima ex qua sermo est, ut scribo, secunda ad quam sermo est, ut scribis, tertia de qua sermo est, ut scribit.*” The corresponding passage in Charisius' grammar (214, 18–23B) is not very close to the *APS*.

grammar, some scholars prefer to identify Cominianus with the Gewährsmann (Schmidt 1989: 124).¹⁹⁰ This hypothesis would have Cominianus (c. 330 AD), not Charisius (c. 360 AD), augment a *Schulgrammatik*-type text with material from more extensive works to offer something for both the advanced student and the less experienced (Schmidt 1989: 124).

My acquaintance with the sources of the Charisius group is not very profound, and I have to be content at this stage with stating that the same source that has extensively influenced the grammars in the Charisius group has most likely also influenced the *APS*. Whether he can be identified with the anonymous teacher of Charisius, or with Cominianus,¹⁹¹ remains open to question. However, this source is not the only one to have influenced the *APS*, as has already emerged from the discussion in this chapter.

In what follows, I will highlight some of the passages in the *APS* with no or with very few exact parallels in other extant Latin grammars. For instance, the opening chapter of the *APS*, *De arte* (I, 3–7), finds its closest parallel in the preface to book 1 of the *Explanationes*, where the compiler has doubtlessly used the *APS* as one of his sources. Elsewhere, the parallels are less clear and do not occur in the grammars of the Charisius group.¹⁹² The chapter on *uox* ('sound') (II, 3–10), which follows that on *ars*, has practically no parallels in the extant Latin grammars apart from the *Explanationes*.¹⁹³ The chapter on *litterae* ('letters') (III, 3–22) presents more conventional doctrine, which is repeated in several Late Antique Latin grammars. Only the very end of that chapter (III, 18ff.) offers more original fare. The chapter on *syllabae* ('syllables') (IV, 3–32) is inconsistent with the majority of discussions appearing in Late Latin grammars, as it seems to combine an exposition of syllables with another exposition concerning accentuation, both of which usually receive a chapter of their own. One explanation for this is that such a combination is due to an accident of transmission, with some of the folios omitted or misplaced. As the resulting chapter is, nevertheless, relatively ordered, it may well reflect the original plan of the *APS*. Also the doctrine on syllables considered long by virtue of their position (*syllabae positione longae*) (IV, 19–30) is inconsistent with all other extant discussions on the subject and does not therefore follow any known grammar. The four definitions listed ahead of the discussion on the parts of speech also mostly represent doctrine not attested elsewhere (V, 3; VI, 3; VII, 3; VIII, 3–6). The definitions of the terms *dictio*

¹⁹⁰ See the discussion by Schmidt (1989: 124).

¹⁹¹ Or whether the teacher of Charisius and Cominianus are, in fact, identical, as some scholars think (cf. Schmidt 1989: 124).

¹⁹² Some parallels, however, do occur in the work of Diomedes and, less certainly, also in the grammars of Victorinus and Audax. See chapter 3.1 below.

¹⁹³ Again, at this instance we are dealing with the later use of the *APS* as a source for the compiler of the *Explanationes*. Particularly the odd definition of *uox* and the subdivision of *uox* into *uox articulata* and *uox inarticulata*, instead of *uox articulata* and *uox confusa*, is intriguing. See also chapter 3.2 below.

and *locutio* are rare, and the definition of *oratio* is different from all other extant definitions of *oratio* in Latin grammars. In the chapter on the noun (*nomen*), the slightly confusingly organized discussion on the subtypes of common nouns (see the chapter 3.6) is naturally not attested in that form in any other grammar. Concerning the chapter on the pronoun, particularly the example in which the name of Scaurus is preserved (X, 4–5) is unique. In the discussion on the verb, the curious solution of discussing frequentative verbs under the *accidens numerus* (‘grammatical number’) (XI, 26–27) is unique in the corpus of Late Antique Latin grammars. Some of the definitions of the parts of speech are unique in their wording, if not in their content: for instance, those of the noun (IX, 3–4) and the participle (XII, 3–4).

That the *APS* has followed more than one source is also evident in the vacillating use of certain terms in this text. The *APS* is not in its scope as extensive as, for example, the grammar of Charisius, where many discussions and opinions from various sources are presented one after the other, with seemingly no regard for streamlining the conflicting doctrine and terminology of the source material.¹⁹⁴ Instead, similarly to Donatus, the author of the *APS* has, for the most part, constructed a unified whole, where any glaring discrepancies in the sources have been dealt with and the outcome is relatively consistent and logical. Still, there remain some inconsistencies in the *APS*; for example, the present tense is referred to as *praesens* in the chapter on the verb (XI, 33),¹⁹⁵ but in the chapter on the participle the term *instans* is used for the present tense instead (XII, 9–10).¹⁹⁶ This most likely suggests different sources for the sections on the participle and on the verb. Also, in the discussion on comparison in the chapter on the noun, both the term *comparatio* (IX, 61) and *conlatio* (IX, 32) occur,¹⁹⁷ again, perhaps, suggesting different sources for these passages. Furthermore, there is conflicting doctrine on *uox* (‘sound’) in the chapters *de uoce* (II, 3ff.) and *de litteris* (III, 3ff.), with the chapter *de uoce* stating that sound forms the basis for *litterae* and the chapter *de litteris* claiming that *littera* is the foundation of intelligible sound.¹⁹⁸ These inconsistencies are, however, relatively few and, as a rule, the terminology appearing in the *APS* is used rather consistently.

The sources for most the passages of the *APS* listed in this chapter are all but impossible to identify, especially as no parallels can be found for some in extant Latin grammars. As the author of

¹⁹⁴ See, for example, the doctrine on the verb in Charisius’ work (209, 24–215, 17B) where the result is quite disorganized due to the wealth of sources and opinions presented one after the other.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. XI, 33: “*Tempora uerbis accidunt tria: praesens, praeteritum, futurum*” and XI, 38–39: “*Primae coniugationis uerba indicatiuo modo tempore praesenti ad secundam personam as litteris terminantur*.”

¹⁹⁶ Cf. XII, 9–10: “*nam participia ueniunt a uerbo actiuo duo: instantis temporis et futuri...*”.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. IX, 32: “*Ergo conlationis gradus sunt tres*” and IX, 61: “*Participia comparationem non recipiunt*”.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. II, 7–8: “*Litteris praeponenda uox est ideo, quia non littera elementum tribuit uoci, sed uox litteris*” and III, 3: “*Littera est elementum uocis articulatae*”.

the *APS*, like Donatus (cf. Holtz 1981: 92), does not name his sources, even the names of the grammarians used as sources elude us. Finally, we will take a look at the diffusion of the *APS* in Late Antiquity and its (possible) utilization in grammatical works other than the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius.

The grammar of Diomedes echoes some passages occurring in the *APS*. Vivien Law considers these similarities to be mostly due to the fact that the *APS* was the work of Q. Terentius Scaurus and that Diomedes had used another, more extensive, grammar by that same author in compiling his work (1987: 80). The similarities between the doctrine of the *APS* and Diomedes do not occur in any of the passages Diomedes attributes to a grammarian called Scaurus;¹⁹⁹ like much of the doctrine appearing in Diomedes' grammar, the sources used for these similar passages remain anonymous. Some of the similarities between the *APS* and the grammar of Diomedes are probably a result of using the same or similar sources to those that the grammars of the Charisius group used.²⁰⁰ However, much of the chapter on *ars* (I, 3–7) in the *APS* is not comparable to the discussion on *ars* in the grammars of the Charisius group. In Diomedes' grammar, on the other hand, the chapter on *ars* (*GL* I: 421, 4ff.) agrees in much of its content with the *APS*.²⁰¹ Diomedes' *modus operandi* in writing his grammars makes it quite difficult to identify the sources for particular passages in his work: he combines several sources into one sentence or passage, modifying his sources to his needs in the process.²⁰² For instance, the definition of *ars* in the *APS* is the following: “*Ars est unius cuiusque rei scientia usu uel traditione [perditionem] percepta*” (I, 3). Compare this to the definition appearing in the grammar of Diomedes: “*Ars est rei cuiusque scientia usu vel traditione vel ratione percepta tendens ad usum aliquem vitae necessarium*” (*GL* I: 421, 4–5). Due to his working method it is entirely possible that Diomedes used the definition appearing in the *APS* as one source for the definition appearing in the beginning of the chapter on *ars* in his grammar, combining it with another to produce a unique definition for *ars*. In addition to the definition of *ars*, the *accidentia* of *littera*, for example, resemble each other in these two grammars,²⁰³ and, considering Diomedes' method of compiling his grammar, direct use of the *APS*

¹⁹⁹ See chapter 1.2, for more details on the attribution of the *APS*.

²⁰⁰ For instance, much of the chapter *de litteris* in both of these works shows signs of using a similar source as, for example, Charisius and Dositheus.

²⁰¹ Cf. I, 3–4 = *GL* I: 421, 8–9; I, 5–6 = *GL* I: 426, 18–20 (in the chapter *de grammatica*); I, 6–7 = *GL* I: 421, 11–13. The definition of *ars* ascribed to Cicero, the Latin etymology of *ars*, and the *artium genera* do not appear in the *APS*, however.

²⁰² Dammer (2001: 20–21) comments that Diomedes' style of writing was at least in part due to a technical revolution in the form of the codex, which made it easier to search for the often short scraps of text he used to compile his “Mosaik” of a grammar.

²⁰³ The discussion on the *accidentia* of *littera* as it appears in Diomedes' work seems to combine two slightly different sources: “*accidunt unicuique littera tria, nomen figura potestas. nomen est quo dicitur vel enuntiatur; figura, cum scripta aspicitur vel notatur; potestas qua valet in ratione metrica, id est cum ad proprietatem suam a reliquis*

cannot be excluded. Naturally, it is possible that Diomedes only knew the doctrine appearing in the *APS* via a common source. However, if Diomedes did use the *APS* directly, its *terminus ante quem* could be fixed to the date of Diomedes' grammar, c. 370–380 AD.

That the compiler of the *Explanationes* has used the *APS* as one of its sources seems certain from the wealth of passages in the two texts that agree word for word. The slight departures from the text of the *APS* may be due to either accidents of transmission or editorial interventions, which must have taken place in the course of compiling the *Explanationes*. According to Paolo De Paolis, the two works that were edited together by Keil as the *Explanationes in artem Donati* (*GL* 4: 486–565) are by two different authors and belong to two different periods (cf. chapter 1.1 above). This poses problems for my hypothesis in that the quotations from the *APS* in the preface to book 1 and the numerous quotations from the *APS* in book 2 of the *Explanationes* would, according to De Paolis, have been made by two different writers. Vivien Law's hypothesis on the matter, namely that the preface to book 1 was originally meant to accompany book 2 instead (1987: 71 n. 12), would suit my theory neatly. According to De Paolis, however, the manuscript evidence does not support this idea (2000: 200). As the later author was writing in continuation of the first work and as he strove to fashion a commentary spanning both grammars of Donatus, perhaps it would not be too bold to suggest that, in the course of his reworking and supplementing the original work, he also wrote the preface to the first book (as a preface to the whole reworked text). In this way we could ascribe all the Scaurus quotations to the one and the same author, and we would not have to think that a rare text such as the *APS* would have been available in two different periods (and locations) in the course of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.

The compilation of grammatical excerpts known as the *Excerpta Andecavensia* also contains some echoes of the doctrine appearing in the *APS*. The parallel passages include, for example, the following: II, 1–2DN ≈ XI, 63–66; III DN ≈ XI, 59–62; XXI, 1–2DN ≈ IX, 102–107; XXII DN ≈ IX, 107ff.; XXIII, 1–2DN ≈ IX, 44–47 + 56–60. The editor of the *Excerpta Andecavensia*, Mario De Nonno, suggests that this text has its origins in the fifth century, possibly in northern Italy (1992: 231). The wording of the parallel passages in the two works does not agree exactly, and we cannot be sure whether the compiler of the *Excerpta Andecavensia* was using the *APS* as his source. Also, we may be dealing with some kind of indirect knowledge of the *APS* through another text, or the similarity between the two texts may be due to a common source. However, the fact that some of the passages do not appear in the *Explanationes* (as well as the late dating of that work) precludes

segregatur" (*GL* 1: 421, 28–31). Part of the wording in Diomedes' account (*vel enuntiatur, vel notatur*) brings to mind the discussion in the *APS* (III, 4–5): "*Accidunt uni cuique litterae nomen, potestas, figura. Nomen est quo enuntiatur, potestas qua ualet, figura qua notatur.*"

the possibility that the author of the *Excerpta Andecavensia* used the *Explanationes* in compiling his work.

With some doubts as to whether Diomedes or the compiler of the *Excerpta Andecavensia* knew the *APS* directly, we can only recognize one Late Antique, or possibly early Medieval (cf. the discussion in chapter 1.1), grammarian who certainly used this text, the compiler of the (second book of the) *Explanationes*. The use of the *Explanationes* was also very limited in the Early Middle Ages, particularly as regards the second book (Law 1982: 17).²⁰⁴ Thus the influence that the *APS* might have had on later grammarians through the use of that work is negligible. The fact that this edition had to be based on only one extant manuscript also confirms that, in addition to not being widely used in Antiquity, the *APS* did not enjoy a wide dissemination in the Middle Ages.²⁰⁵ Worse still, the *APS* was transmitted for posterity as a part of another grammatical text, without even a title of its own (see the discussion in chapter 1.1). For a text relatively similar to the grammars of Donatus, the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* certainly enjoyed a very different fate compared to its more famous counterpart, the *Ars maior*. But the fate of the *APS* was by no means unique; most shorter works of the *Schulgrammatik* type fared no better. Works such as the grammars of Ps.-Asper or Dositheus competed unsuccessfully with Donatus' works, which had become dominant by the start of the sixth century (Law 1997: 64). Although the *APS* and the grammars of Ps.-Asper and Augustine, for instance, enjoyed some popularity in the ninth century, they ultimately failed to establish themselves (Law 1997: 62), most likely being deemed too similar to Donatus, whose position had become unassailable by that time.

²⁰⁴ In her monograph *The Insular Latin Grammarians*, Law (1982: 17) finds no significant influence by the first book of the *Explanationes* on Insular grammarians. The situation regarding the second book is even more bleak: it may possibly have been known to Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, but it was otherwise unknown (1982: 17 n. 28).

²⁰⁵ Also other shorter works of the *Schulgrammatik* type are transmitted in a very limited number of manuscripts, such as the *ars* of Ps.-Asper (found in only two manuscripts) (Law 1997: 66 n. 5). This is in line with the relatively modest influence of the short *Schulgrammatik*-type grammars on early Medieval grammatical texts (Law 1997: 62, 66 n. 5).

1.5 Notes on the Edition

The text of the edition of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* is based on the ninth-century manuscript Clm 6281,²⁰⁶ which I have been able to examine at first hand in Munich as well as through microfilm and digitized copies. Due to the minimal number of manuscript witnesses, other evidence has also been taken into account in establishing the text.

The article by Vivien Law,²⁰⁷ in which the discovery of this text was first made public, contains small sections of the text considered significant by Law in establishing the attribution of the text or its relationships with other texts. These sections²⁰⁸ mostly only report the readings in the manuscript Clm 6281, but at times they show also editorial interventions by Law; where these have been accepted into the edition, they are signalled as originating from her article.²⁰⁹

The edition of the *Explanationes in artem Donati* by Heinrich Keil²¹⁰ contains numerous passages that have their origin in the *APS*²¹¹ and sometimes preserve readings that are preferable to the readings present in Clm 6281. When the text of the edition of the *APS* is emended based on the text of the *Explanationes*, the source for this correction is indicated in the apparatus.²¹² When Keil's emendations or conjectures concerning the text of the *Explanationes* have been accepted into the present edition, they are signalled as such.²¹³ Keil's edition of the *Explanationes* is not based on all the available manuscript evidence, and the nature of the text itself is today considered rather different from how Keil viewed it (cf. De Paolis 2000: *passim*). Therefore, in using the edition of the *Explanationes* to emend the text of the *APS* all changes have been carefully considered. For the most part this recourse has only been put to use when Clm 6281 omits parts of the text completely or the emendation to the text of the *APS* based on the *Explanationes* has been significant.

²⁰⁶ The manuscript Clm 18181, which is an eleventh century apograph of Clm 6281 is not taken into account in this edition (see p. 2 & 2 n. 11 above).

²⁰⁷ V. Law (1987): "An Unnoticed Late Latin Grammar: The *Ars Minor* of Scaurus?". *RhM* 130, (67–89).

²⁰⁸ The sections of the *APS* which appear in Law's article are the following (the numbering refers to the present edition): I, 3–4; I, 6–7; III, 3–5; VIII, 3; IX, 6–10; X, 3–5; XII, 27–30; XIII, 3–4; XIV, 11–24; XV, 6–13.

²⁰⁹ The page numbers following Law's name refer to her 1987 article; they have been included to help the reader consult the relevant passages in that article.

²¹⁰ *GL* 4: 486–565.

²¹¹ The sections of the *APS* with corresponding passages in the edition of the *Explanationes* are the following (the numbering refers to the present edition): I, 3; I, 5–7; II, 3–8; II, 9–10; IX, 90–94; IX, 96–97; IX, 102–164; XI, 56–66; XIII, 22–24; XIV, 5–24; XV, 6–19; XVI, 3–10.

²¹² See, for instance, II, 3 aer] *Expl.* (487) *aeris M.*

²¹³ See, for example, XIV, 22 rem] *del. Keil* (562). Again, the numbers following Keil's name or that of the *Explanationes* (*Expl.*) (see n. 213) have been included to help the reader to find the relevant passage in Keil's edition, where more information can be found.

The apparatus containing the *loci similes* appearing in Latin grammars as well as the origin of the literary quotations follows on each page immediately below the text itself. Only the instances where the text of the *APS* and that appearing in other grammatical works agree both in content and wording in a significant manner are included into this apparatus. Passages with looser ties to the *APS* are discussed in the commentary at the end of this volume.

The apparatus of manuscript readings follows that containing the *loci similes*. The apparatus of manuscript readings is positive. I have not included the most common orthographic variants, such as vacillation in writing *ae/e*, *eli*, *i/y*, *h/-*, and so on, which occur with relative frequency in the manuscript. I have made an exception to this rule where the variants represent possible alternatives (such as *his/is*). Also, I have not indicated the abbreviations used in the manuscript.

The orthography of the manuscript Clm 6281, M, is relatively ‘correct’ but it does display some variation as regards *ae/e*, *eli*, and the like. As the manuscript is quite far removed from the time of the writing of the *APS*, I see no pressing reason to preserve the graphic variants of M in the edition. I have, however, retained most of the unassimilated forms of the prefixes appearing in the text. This is in line with the copyist’s practice and, more importantly, better suits the content of the text, where such prefixes are classed as a separate part of speech, that is, prepositions.²¹⁴ I have also decided to write out numbers in letters, while the manuscript sometimes contains also Roman numerals. I have introduced the Greek lettering for the terms of Greek origin appearing in the text, which is in line with the practice found in most editions of Late Antique Latin grammars. Naturally, the punctuation, numbering, and division into paragraphs have been modernized and are not based on those found in the manuscript.

The sigla are the following: M stands for the manuscript Clm 6281 (s. IX 2/4). M¹ is the scribe correcting his own hand. There are no later correcting hands. M* stands for alterations made by deleting letters, where one cannot say exactly when the alteration has been made and who has made it. The most common signs indicating additions to the text, corrupt passages, and the like, are in use in this edition.²¹⁵ Literary quotations are printed in italics within inverted commas.²¹⁶ Other examples are set apart from the text with inverted commas.²¹⁷

²¹⁴ See, for instance, XIV, 29–31: “*In praepositio quando [locum] alii parti orationis praeponitur, dupliciter ac diuerse ualet, aut enim auget positiuae uocis significationem, ut inponens, instans, aut derogat, ut inmitis, infelix.*”

²¹⁵ These signs include angle brackets, < >, to indicate additions to the text, square brackets, [], to indicate editorial deletions, as well as obeli, ††, to indicate corrupt passages, and <***> to indicate a lacuna.

²¹⁶ For example, IX, 97: ‘*Dardanio Anchisae*’.

²¹⁷ For example, IX, 4: ‘Roma, Tiberis’.

2. *Ars Pseudo-Scauri*

CONSPECTVS SIGLORVM

| | |
|----------------|---|
| M | <i>Monacensis</i> 6281 (s. IX 2/4), ff. 52r–62v |
| M ¹ | <i>librarius se ipse corrigens</i> |
| M* | <i>M a nescioquo correctus</i> |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| A.Bob. | La grammatica dell' <i>Anonymus Bobiensis</i> , ed. M. De Nonno, pp. 1–53. |
| Asper | <i>Aspri grammatici ars</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 5: 547–554. |
| Aud. | <i>Audacis de Scauri et Palladii libris excerpta per interrogationem et responsionem</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 7: 320–362. |
| Aug. | <i>Ars sancti Augustini pro fratrum mediocritate breuiata</i> , ed. C. Weber, pp. 7–31. |
| Ps.Aug. | <i>Ps. Aurelii Augustini regulae</i> , ed. L. Martorelli, pp. 4–145. |
| Char. | <i>Charisii artis grammaticae libri V</i> , ed. C. Barwick, pp. 1–480. |
| Cons. | <i>Consentii ars de nomine et uerbo</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 5: 338–385. |
| De nom. | Tre testi grammaticali Bobbiensi, [<i>Valeri Probi</i>] <i>De nomine</i> , ed. M. Passalacqua, pp. 61–75. |
| Diom. | <i>Diomedis artis grammaticae libri III</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 1: 299–529. |
| Don.mai. | Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical : étude sur l' <i>Ars Donati</i> et sa diffusion (IVe–IXe siècle) et édition critique, ed. L. Holtz, pp. 603–674. |
| Dos. | <i>Grammatica Dosithei magistri</i> , ed. G. Bonnet, pp. 2–98. |
| Exc.And. | Un esempio di dispersione della tradizione grammaticale latina: gli inediti <i>Excerpta Andecavensia</i> , ed. M. De Nonno, pp. 241–253. |
| Expl. | [<i>Sergii</i>] <i>explanationum in artem Donati libri II</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 4: 486–565. |
| Gel. | <i>Auli Gellii Noctes Atticae</i> , libri I–XX. |
| Inst.Art. | <i>Probi instituta artium</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 4: 47–192. |
| Mar.Vict. | <i>Marii Victorini ars grammatica</i> , ed. I. Mariotti, pp. 65–96. = M <i>Marii Victorini ars grammatica</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 6: 3–184. = K |
| P.Lit.Lond. | P. Lit. London 184, a <i>Latin ars grammatica</i> , ed. Wouters (1979), pp. 97–98. |
| Sac. | <i>Marii Plotii Sacerdotis artium grammaticarum libri tres</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 6: 427–546. |
| Vict. | <i>Ars Victorini grammatici</i> , ed. H. Keil, <i>GL</i> 6: 187–205. |

| | |
|----------|--|
| De Nonno | Emendations by Prof. Mario De Nonno (by personal communication). |
| Keil | H. Keil's editorial interventions in the edition of the <i>Expl.</i> (<i>GL</i> 4: 486–565). |
| Law | Emendations by Dr. Vivien Law in the article “An Unnoticed Late Latin Grammar: The <i>Ars Minor</i> of Scaurus?” (<i>RhM</i> 130, pp. 67–89). |
| Luhtala | Emendations by Docent Anneli Luhtala (by personal communication). |

I DE ARTE

Ars est unius cuiusque rei scientia usu uel traditione [perditionem] percepta. Ars ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς dicta est; unde et ueteres artem etiam pro uirtute usurpauerunt.

5 Ars grammatica praecipue consistit <in> intellectu poetarum et in recte scribendi loquendique ratione. Grammatice ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων dicta est; unde et Romani a litteris appellauerunt litteraturam, item grammaticum litteratorem.

II DE VOCE

Vox est aer ictus sensibilis auditu, uerbis emissa et exacta sensus prolatio. Haec aut articulata est aut inarticulata. Inarticulata est quae auditur et non percipitur, ut infantis uagitus, 5 equi hinnitus, mugitus bouis. Articulata est quae auditur et percipitur et est interpretabilis, ex qua constant litterae.

Litteris praeponenda uox est ideo, quia non littera elementum tribuit uoci, sed uox litteris, quae utique hominis est etiam sine litteris. Ita enim uoce constant litterae, litteris syllabae, syllabis exprimitur uel breuis dictio uel numerosa, quae multiplicem compleat 10 orationem.

I, 3: Expl. 486, 9-10 (ex Scauri arte); Diom. 421, 4-5.
47, 17-18.

5-6: Expl. 486, 15-16; Diom. 426, 18-20.

3-4: Diom. 421, 8-9; Inst.Art.
6-7: Expl. 486,

II, 3: Expl. 487, 3-4.

3-6: Expl. 487, 4-8.

7-8: Expl. 487, 9-10.

9-10: Expl. 14-15.

I, 3 perditionem] *del. Law (71)*
poetarum] *scripsi* paetarum *M*
rationem *M*
II, 3 aer] *Expl. (487)* aeris *M*
Keil (487) sensus et exacta *M*
8 constant] constat *M*

3-4 ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς] apotes aretes *M*
6 loquendique] *scripsi* -ue *M*
ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων] apoton gramaton *M*
auditu] *Expl. (487)* auditus *M*
7 praeponenda] *Expl. (487)* praeponendis *M*

5 in¹] *Expl. (486)*
ratione] *scripsi*
et exacta sensus]

III DE LITTERIS

Littera est elementum uocis articulatae. Elementum est unius cuiusque rei initium, a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resoluitur. Accidunt uni cuique litterae nomen, potestas, figura. Nomen est quo enuntiatur, potestas qua ualet, figura qua notatur.

Litterarum aliae sunt uocales, aliae consonantes. Vocales sunt quae per se proferuntur et per se syllabam faciunt. Sunt autem numero quinque: ‘a e i o u’. Harum duae, ‘i’ et ‘u’, transeunt aliquando in consonantium potestatem, cum aut ipsae inter se geminantur aut cum aliis uocalibus coniunguntur, ut ‘Iuno, uates’.

Consonantium species est duplex: sunt enim aliae semiuocales, aliae mutae. Semiuocales sunt quae per se quidem proferuntur, sed per se syllabam facere non possunt. Sunt autem numero septem: ‘f l m n r s x’. Ex his una duplex, ‘x’, constat enim aut ex ‘g’ et ‘s’ litteris <aut> ex ‘c’ <et> ‘s’>, ut rex regis, pix picis; ideoque haec littera a quibusdam negatur esse. Mutae sunt quae nec per se proferri possunt nec per se syllabam facere. Sunt autem numero nouem: ‘b c d g <h> k p q t’. Ex his superuacuae quibusdam uidentur esse ‘k’ et ‘q’, quod ‘c’ littera harum locum implere possit. ‘H’ quoque adspirationis notam, non litteram, existimamus; ‘y’ et ‘z’ propter Graeca nomina admittimus.

Tredecim autem omnino litteris extremitates nominum latinorum terminantur: ‘a e i <o> u c l m n r s t x’, ut ‘tabula, monile, frugi, ratio, genu, allec, mel, scamnum, lumen, arbor, flos, caput, nox’.

Ceterum de cognatione litterarum quae multiformis <est> satis abundeque Varronis praecepta seruamus.

III, 3-4: Expl. 487, 10-11 + 15-16; Char. 4, 10-12B; Dos. 7, 2-4Bo; Inst.Art. 48, 33-34; Aud. 321, 14-16; Diom. 421, 17-19. **4-5:** Char. 4, 12-14B; Dos. 7, 4-6Bo; Mar.Vict. 67, 5M; Inst.Art. 48, 35-36 + 49, 1-2; Diom. 421, 28-31. **6-9:** Dos. 7, 6-13Bo; Char. 4, 14-17 + 5, 4-7B; Don.mai. 603, 6-7 + 8-9 + 604, 1-2H; Mar.Vict. 67, 6-7M; Inst. Art. 49, 10-16; Diom. 422, 9 + 14-16. **10-14:** Dos. 7, 14-20Bo; Char. 5, 7-11 + 19-22B; Mar.Vict. 67, 8M; Don.mai. 603, 7 + 604, 10-11H. **14-17:** Dos. 7, 20-26Bo; Char. 5, 22-26 + 29-30B; Mar.Vict. 67, 10M; Don.mai. 604, 15-605, 3H; Diom. 423, 9-12 + 15-16. **18-20:** Vict. 196, 12-17; Aud. 327, 8-13; Don.mai. 628, 10-13.

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|
| III, 3 unius] <i>Expl. (487) unus M</i> | 5 quo] <i>scripsi quod M</i> | 9 uocalibus] |
| <i>scripsi</i> -bibus <i>M</i> | 11 sed] <i>scripsi</i> et <i>M</i> | 12 duplex] <i>M'</i> |
| 12-13 g et s] s et g <i>M</i> | 13 aut] <i>suppleui</i> | c] <i>scripsi</i> l <i>M</i> g <i>M'</i> |
| profferis <i>M</i> | 15 h] <i>suppleui</i> | 14 proferri] <i>M'</i> |
| <i>scripsi</i> adspirationis <i>M</i> | 19 o] <i>suppleui</i> | 16 possit] <i>scripsi</i> posset <i>M</i> |
| | | adspirationis] |
| | | 21 est] <i>suppl.</i> De Nonno |

IV DE SYLLABIS

Syllaba est littera uocalis uel litterarum copulatio una comprehensa iunctura. Syllaba aut littera fit, ut ‘a’, ‘o’, aut litteris, ut ‘ae’, ‘te’. In breui autem syllaba tempus unum est, in longa duo.

In omnibus monosyllabis obseruabimus siue breues sint, siue positione longae fuerint, ut acuuntur, sicuti ‘mel, fel, ars, nox’. Si uero natura longae fuerint, inflectuntur, ut ‘sol, res, spes’. In disyllabis uero uocibus †uos semper acuitur ut ille iste quisquis† <***> In trisyllabis autem et tetrasyllabis et plurimarum syllabarum secunda ab ultima obseruanda est; haec si natura longa fuerit, inflectitur, ut ‘Othonis, Neronis, Catonis’. Si uero positione longa fuerit, acuitur ipsa, sicut ‘Metellus, Catullus, gemellus’. Si uero breuis fuerit, ante se quaerit syllabam, ut eam acuet, sicuti ‘Valgius, Messius, Sergius’. Hac autem lege non tenentur quaedam aduerbiorum, item coniunctionum, nec minus praepositionum, item interiectionum syllabarum.

Syllabae partim longae sunt, partim breues. Breues sunt quae correptis uocalibus constant, ut ‘a’ uel ‘e’ et ceteris, aut cum correptae recipiunt ante se semiuocales aut mutas, ut ‘ta’, ‘ra’. Longae syllabae aut natura fiunt, aut positione. Natura longae fiunt, cum uocali producta constant, ut ‘o’, aut pluribus uocalibus longam syllabam facientibus, ut ‘ae, tae, uae’. Positione longae syllabae octo modis fiunt: primo fit quotiens syllaba breuis consonanti finitur littera et excipitur a consonanti [m]; secundo quotiens syllaba breuis duabus litteris consonantibus finitur, ut ‘ast’, ‘est’, ut ‘ast ego, quae diuum incedo regina’, et ‘est in secessu longo locus’; tertio quotiens syllaba breuis excipitur a duabus consonantibus, ut ‘Acrisioneis

IV, 3: Dos. 11, 2-4Bo; Char. 8, 9-10B; Vict. 196, 19-20; Aud. 327, 15-16.

4-5: Dos. 11, 8-

9Bo; Char. 8, 17-18B; Char. 9, 14-15B; Vict. 197, 4-5; Aud. 327, 20-21.

8-11: Diom. 431, 23-27.

21: Aen. 1.46.

21-22: Aen. 1.159.

22-23: Aen. 7.410.

IV, 3 copulatio] scripsi conpulatio M

7 inflectuntur] scripsi inplectuntur M

15 syllabae] scripsi litterae M

17 ta, ra] De Nonno atra M

20 m] deleui

secensu M

21 ego] scripsi ergo M

22 duabus] scripsi duobus M

6 obseruabimus] M^l

12 hac] scripsi haec M

16 ut²] M* aut M

19 syllaba breuis] conieci litteras breues M

et] scripsi ut M

siue¹] M^l

secessu] M^l

acrisioneis] scripsi -nis M

25 *Danae fundasse colonis*’ et *‘Atrides Protei Menelaus adusque columnas / exsulat*’; quarto
 quotiens syllaba brevis duplici littera terminatur - est autem apud nos duplex littera ‘x’ - ut *‘ex*
illo fluere ac retro sublapsa [se] referri’; quinto si syllaba brevis a sequenti duplici littera
 excipitur, ut *‘exulibusne datur ducenda Lauinia Teucris*’; sexto quotiens syllaba brevis
 excipitur a uocali loco consonantis posita, ‘u’ uel ‘i’, ut *‘at Venus obscuro gradientis aere*
saepsit’ et *‘at Iuno e summo, qui nunc Albanus habetur*’; septimo si correpta [per se] uocalis
 littera ‘i’ sequentem habeat, ut *‘Troiaque nunc staret*’; octauo si correpta <uocalis> cum
 30 consonanti uel per se syllabam efficit, qua pars orationis finiatur, ut *‘hoc erat, alma parens*’.

Omnes syllabae aut acuto, aut graui, aut inflexo <accentu> proferuntur, ita ut in nulla
 parte orationis plus una flexa <uel acuta> appareat.

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 23: <i>Aen.</i> 11.262-263. 1.411. | 24-25: <i>Aen.</i> 2.169. 28: <i>Aen.</i> 12.134. | 26: <i>Aen.</i> 7.359. 29: <i>Aen.</i> 2.56. | 27-28: <i>Aen.</i> 30: <i>Aen.</i> 2.664. |
| 23 protei] <i>scripsi</i> proceus <i>M</i> | menelaus] <i>scripsi</i> emine laus <i>M</i> | 24 ex] <i>M</i> ^l om. <i>M</i> | |
| 25 ac] <i>scripsi</i> hac <i>M</i> | 26 ducenda] <i>scripsi</i> dicenda <i>M</i> | 27 uel] <i>M</i> ^l | |
| obscuru] <i>scripsi</i> obscuro <i>M</i> | 28 saepsit] <i>M</i> ^l | albanus] <i>scripsi</i> albamus <i>M</i> | |
| per se] <i>deleui</i> | 29 -que] <i>scripsi</i> qui <i>M</i> | uocalis] <i>suppleui</i> | |
| 30 inflexo] <i>scripsi</i> inflexosa <i>M</i> | accentu] <i>suppleui</i> | proferuntur] | |
| <i>scripsi</i> ferunt <i>M</i> | 32 flexa] <i>De Nonno</i> flex <i>M</i> | uel acuta] <i>suppl. De Nonno</i> | |

V DE DITIONE

Dictio est uox figuram habens significantium uocum.

VI DE LOCUTIONE

Locutio est uox litteris et syllabis conligata simplicis intellectus.

VII <DE DEFINITIONE>

Definitio est <oratio> quae id de quo quaeritur aperte describit et explet et determinat.

VIII <DE ORATIONE>

Oratio est significantibus uocibus secundum rationem ordinata sententia, [ut Puplius Cornelius Scipio Africamus sunt alia sola nomina ut Roma Appenninus Mars] ut '*omnis homines, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus summa ope niti decet, ne u(itam) s(ilentio) t(ranseant) u(el)u(ti) p(ecora).*'

V, 3: Mar.Vict. 5, 2K; P.Lit.Lond. 184. 97, 5-6Wo.

VII, 3: Char. 192, 21-22B; Diom. 420, 25-421, 1; Vict. 188, 25-27; Aud. 324, 2-4.

VIII, 4-6: Sal. Cat. 1.1.

VII, 1 de definitione] *suppleui*

3 oratio] *suppleui*

VIII, 1 de oratione] *suppleui*

3 significantibus] *Law (77) significationibus M*

5 ne] *scripsi n.e. M*

IX DE NOMINE

Nomen est pars orationis significans rem corporalem aut incorporealem proprie communiterue; proprie, ut ‘Roma, Tiberis’, communiter, ut ‘urbs, flumen’. Nomini accidunt
5 sex: qualitas, comparatio, genus, numerus, figura, casus.

Qualitas nominum bipertita est: aut enim propria sunt nomina, aut appellatiua. Propria sunt quae proprietates nominum tam deorum quam hominum quam montium quam urbium quam fluminum continent; deorum, ut ‘Iuppiter, Apollo’, hominum, ut ‘Cato’ uel ‘Cicero’,
10 montium, ut ‘Cynthus, Olympus’, urbium, ut ‘Roma, Carthago’, fluminum, ut ‘Nilus, Eridanus’ et huiuscemodi alia similia. Diuiduntur autem propria, sed hominum sola, nomina in species quattuor: praenomen, nomen, cognomen, agnomen, ut ‘Puplius Cornelius Scipio Africanus’. Sunt alia sola nomina, ut ‘Roma, Appenninus, Mars, Ceres’, aut bina, ut ‘Iuno Lucina, Liber pater, Venus Verticordia’.

Appellatiua autem in duas species diuiduntur, quarum alia significat res corporales, ut
15 est ‘homo, terra, mare’, alia incorporeales, ut est ‘pietas, iustitia, dignitas’. Appellatiuorum differentiae sunt quattuor: alia enim rem significant, alia numerum, alia gentem, alia ordinem; rem significant, ut ‘homo, paries’; numerum, ut ‘unus, duo’; ordinem, ut ‘primus, secundus’; gentem, ut ‘Graecus, Hispanus’. Horum omnium supra scriptorum nulla recipiunt conparationem; neque enim ‘Graecus’ ‘Graecior’, aut ‘Hispanus’ ‘Hispanior’ potest fieri.
20 Eadem et in ceteris ratio est.

Sunt quaedam quae Graeci τὸν πρὸς τί dicunt, id est ad aliquid [dicta referuntur], quae per se intellegi sola non possunt, ut ‘pater, mater, frater’. Coniungunt enim sibi et illa per quae intellegi possunt, ut ‘meus, tuus, noster, uester’. Sunt et his similia, quae Graece dicuntur

IX 3-4: Char. 193, 10-13B; Dos. 15, 2-5Bo; A.Bob. 1, 8-10D; Diom. 320, 11-13; Don.mai. 614, 2-3H.

4-5: Don.mai. 614, 3-4H; Cons. 338, 16-17; Aug. II §1W.

6: Don.mai. 614, 6H; Asper 549, 25-26; Diom. 320, 29-30.

10-12: Char. 193, 14-17H; Inst.Art. 119, 31-33; Don.mai. 614, 6-7H; Cons. 339, 10-12; Diom. 321, 3-4.

12-13: Diom. 320, 30-32; Asper 549, 28-29. **14-15:** Don.mai. 615, 1-2H; Char. 193, 24-194, 3B.

21-25: Char. 198, 2-9B; Dos. 23, 1-8Bo; A.Bob. 6, 18-23D; Diom. 322, 27-32.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| IX, 3 significans] <i>scripsi</i> significatis <i>M</i> | 4 communiter] <i>scripsi</i> comniter <i>M</i> | 8 deorum] <i>M*</i> |
| apollo] <i>coni. Law</i> (78 n. 33) sol <i>M</i> | hominum] <i>M^l</i> | 9 olympus] <i>olympus M</i> |
| 11 nomen cognomen] <i>scripsi</i> cognomen nomen <i>M</i> | | puplius cornelius] <i>scripsi</i> p.c. <i>M</i> |
| 12 appenninus] <i>M^l</i> | 13 verticordia] <i>scripsi</i> uenticorda <i>M</i> | 14 significat] <i>De Nonno</i> |
| -cant <i>M</i> | 17 paries] <i>scripsi</i> partes <i>M</i> | 18 hispanus] <i>scripsi</i> spanus <i>M</i> |
| 19 nulla] <i>scripsi</i> nullam <i>M</i> | recipiunt] <i>scripsi</i> recipit <i>M</i> | 20 ceteris] <i>M^l</i> |
| 21 τὸν πρὸς τί] <i>tonprosti M</i> | 22 per ¹] <i>scripsi</i> pro <i>M</i> | coniungunt] <i>scripsi</i> -guntur <i>M</i> |

25 τῶν πρὸς τί πως ἔχοντα, id est ad aliquid <quodam modo> habentia intellectum, ut ‘dexterior, sinisterior’. Quaedam mediae potestatis sunt, quae significationem a coniunctis sumunt, ut ‘magnus, fortis’. Haec enim per se nullum habent intellectum et ideo <a> quibusdam adiectiones uocantur, ut ‘magnus uir, fortis exercitus’.

30 Comparantur autem ea quae qualitatem significant, ut ‘pulcher, decens’, aut quantitatem, ut ‘magnus, altus’. Sed non omnia nomina quae in quantitate sunt, aut in qualitate, comparantur. [sed quae comparationem recipiunt] Ceterum ‘mediocris, fatuus, mortuus’ et his similia in qualitate sunt, sed tantum uno gradu comparantur.

Ergo conlationis gradus sunt tres: positivus, ut ‘fortis’, comparativus, ut ‘fortior’, superlativus, ut ‘fortissimus’. Sed non quidem in omnibus nominibus plena conlatio est. Nam quaedam primum tantum gradum habent, ut ‘mediocris, fatuus, mortuus’; quaedam primum et secundum, ut ‘iuuenis iuuenior’, ‘senex senior’; quaedam primum et nouissimum, ut ‘fidus fidissimus’, ‘pius piissimus’ - nam pro secundo gradu magis aduerbium ponimus, ut ‘magis pius’ - quaedam secundum et nouissimum, ut ‘posterior postremus’, ‘exterior extremus’; quaedam nouissimum tantum, ut ‘summus, nouissimus’. Quaedam quamvis omnes gradus habeant, tamen in conlatione mutantur, ut ‘bonus melior optimus’, ‘malus peior pessimus’.

40 Sunt multa nomina [quae absolutam uim habent] uno [etiam] gradu conlationis figurata, quae recipere conlationem possunt, [sobrius] <si illis> magis et maxime aduerbia iungamus, ut ‘magis sobrius’ et ‘maxime sobrius’. Ad quorum inuersam significationem ‘minus’ et ‘minime’ aduerbia iunguntur, ut ‘minus sobrius’ et ‘minime sobrius’.

45 Sunt multa nomina quae absolutum non habent, sed ex aduerbiis ueniunt, ut ‘ulterior ultimus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘ultra’; ‘inferior infimus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘infra’; ‘prior primus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘prius’; ‘superior supremus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘supra’; ‘peior pessimus’ ab eo, quod est ‘peius’.

Comparativus autem gradus casui iungitur ablatiuo numero utroque, ut ‘illo et illis

25-27: Char. 198, 15-19B; Dos. 23, 16-19Bo; A.Bob. 6, 28-7,3D; Diom. 323, 2-5.

44-47: Char. 199, 10-14B; Dos. 25, 12-17Bo; A.Bob. 7, 22-26D; Exc.And. 247, 177-179DN.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 24 τῶν πρὸς τί πως ἔχοντα] | ton prosti prose contra M | quodam modo] | suppleui |
| 26 a] suppleui | 30 sed - recipiunt] | del. De Nonno | 31 qualitate] |
| scripsi quantitate M | tantum] | scripsi tamen M | |
| 32 conlationis] | scripsi conpationis M | 33 non quidem] | scripsi quidem non M |
| scripsi -simus M | | 38 nouissimum] | |
| figurata] | scripsi figura M | 40 quae - habent] | deleui |
| sobrius] | deleui | 41 conlationem] | scripsi conpationem M |
| sobrius ²] M ¹ | si illis] | suppleui | 42 sobrius ¹] M ¹ |
| inuersam] | scripsi inuentam M | significationem] | scripsi -ne M |
| minus] | scripsi minimus M | 44 absolutum non] | scripsi absolutam uim M |
| 45 infimus] | scripsi infirmus M | 48 casui] | scripsi casu M |

fortior'. Superlatius autem casui iungitur genetiuo numero tantum plurali, ut 'fortissimus
 50 illorum'. Quidam putant comparatium gradum plurali numero tantummodo iungendum, quod
 est falsum. Nam comparatius gradus casui iungitur ablatiuo numero utroque, superlatius
 autem <genetiuo> numero tantum plurali diligenter animaduersa loquendi ratione; quia
 superlatius gradus multitudini propriae et familiari personae iungitur, ut 'fortissimus
 Romanorum Scipio' et 'doctissimus Romanorum Cato'; comparatius autem diuersae et alieni
 55 generis multitudini, ut 'fortior Poenis Scipio' et 'doctior Gallis Cato'.

Sunt multa nomina quae comparatiua uidentur in pronuntiatione, sed sunt diminutia in
 significatione, ut 'infirmior, crudior'; non enim augment posituae uocis significatum, sed
 minuunt. Nam 'infirmior' minus aliquanto ac paene infirmum significat, et 'crudior' non
 magis crudum, sed paene crudum significat. Quale apud Vergilium: '*tristior et lac(rimis)*
 60 *o(culos) s(uffusa)*'.

Participia comparationem non recipiunt, et ideo pleraque participia <quando>
 comparantur, fiunt nomina, ut †cultus, uisus†. [sed participia huius culti huius uisu faciunt
 genetiuo singulari porro cum sint nomina huius cultus huius uisus faciunt]

Item nomina alia sunt generalia, ut 'animal, corpus'; alia specialia, 'ut homo, lapis'.
 65 Item alia primae positionis, ut 'mons, capra'; alia diminutia κατὰ ὑποκορισμόν, ut
 'monticulus, capella', alia deriuatiua, ut 'montanus, caprarius, monticularius, capellarius'.

Genus est origo nascendi. Sunt autem genera nominum tria: masculinum, femininum,
 neutrum. Masculinum genus est cui numero singulari nominatiuo casu pronomen
 praeponimus hic, ut 'hic miles'. Femininum est cui pronomen praeponimus haec, ut 'haec
 70 mulier'. Neutrum est cui pronomen praeponimus hoc, ut 'hoc negotium'. Ex his commune fit
 duobus modis: sunt autem communia aut ex genere masculino et feminino, ut 'hic et haec
 canis'; aut ex feminino singulari et neutro plurali, ut 'haec magna' – dicimus enim 'haec
 magna mulier' et 'haec magna mancipia' – aut ex omnibus tribus, ut 'hic et haec et hoc felix'
 Sunt promiscua nomina quae Graeci ἐπίκοινά appellant, ut 'passer, aquila'. Haec enim sub

56-60: Exc.And. 247, 181-188DN. **59-60:** Aen. 1.228. **64:** Don.mai. 617, 5H; Cons. 342, 24-25. **74-76:** Char. 194, 18-23B; Dos. 17, 10-15Bo; A.Bob. 3, 1-4D.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 49 casui] <i>scripsi</i> casu <i>M</i> | 51 casui] <i>scripsi</i> casu <i>M</i> | 52 genetiuo] <i>suppleui</i> |
| animaduersa] <i>De Nonno</i> anim adiuersa <i>M</i> ^l | | 56 diminutia] <i>scripsi</i> minutia <i>M</i> |
| 60 lac(rimis) o(culos) s(uffusa)] <i>scripsi</i> lacos <i>M</i> | | 61 quando] <i>suppleui</i> |
| 62-63 sed - faciunt] <i>deleui</i> | | 64 lapis] <i>M</i> ^l om. <i>M</i> |
| κατὰ ὑποκορισμόν] cata ipoccoris mon <i>M</i> | | 65 ut ^l] <i>M</i> [*] |
| caprella] <i>M</i> ^l capella <i>M</i> | 67 tria] <i>M</i> ^l triu <i>M</i> | 66 monticulus] <i>scripsi</i> monticula <i>M</i> |
| 68 singulari] <i>M</i> ^l sigulari <i>M</i> | 69 praeponimus] <i>scripsi</i> proponimus <i>M</i> | |
| 74 ἐπίκοινά] epycoena <i>M</i> | | |

75 uno genere duorum habent intellectum; nam et passerem feminam accipimus et aquilam
masculino quoque genere intellegimus, quamvis feminino tantum genere dicatur.

Numeri nominum sunt duo: singularis et pluralis, singularis, ut ‘hic uir’, pluralis, ut ‘hi
uiri’. Sunt utriusque numeri, ut ‘res, nubes, dies’. Sunt nomina semper singularia, ut ‘aurum,
plumbum, oleum, garum, triticum, uinum’; sunt semper pluralia, ut ‘sordes, moenia, cancelli,
80 loculi, scalae, quadrigae, scopae, arma, castra, exta, sabbata’; sunt quaedam <positione>
singularia intellectu pluralia, ut ‘populus, contio, plebs’; sunt quaedam positione pluralia
intellectu singularia, ut ‘Mycenae, Cumae, Thebae’; sunt quaedam quae neque singulari neque
plurali numero recte adiungi possunt, et ideo duali adsignanda sunt, ut ‘duo, ambo, uterque,
neuter’.

85 Figura nominum duplex est: aut enim simplicia sunt nomina, ut ‘felix’, aut composita, ut
‘infelix’. Conponuntur autem nomina modis quattuor: aut ex duabus partibus orationis
integris, ut ‘suburbanus’, aut ex duabus corruptis, ut ‘opifex, artifex’, aut ex integra et
corrupta, ut ‘ineptus, insulsus’, aut ex corrupta et integra, ut ‘omnipotens’. Aliquando etiam
uidentur ex pluribus, ut ‘inexpugnabilis, inperterritus’.

90 Ceterum illa [naturaliter] sunt quae a Graecis patronymica, a nobis patria dicuntur, ut
‘Atrides, Pelides’, et ea quidem deducuntur apud Homerum a patre et ab auo et retro, apud
Lycophronem et ab uxore; sunt et illa quae naturaliter intelleguntur [quorum aut patrymones]
ut [ad] *Scipiadas duos bello*, id est ‘Scipiones’. Aut dionymon, ut ‘Paris Alexander’,
‘Elissa Dido’; aut homonymon, quod uno nomine plura significet, ut ‘nepos, acies’; aut
95 synonymon, quod pluribus nominibus idem tamen significat tamquam ‘terram, humum,
solum’, ‘ensis, mucro, gladius’; aut feronymon, ut ‘Pasiphae, Hippolytus’, a solis scilicet
splendore <et> equorum distractione; aut eponymon, ut ‘*Dardanio Anchisae*’.

78-82: Char. 195, 3-9B; Dos. 17, 24-30Bo; A.Bob. 3, 11-15D; Don.mai 623, 1-9H.

82-84: Expl. 540, 6-8.

85-89: Char. 194, 24-29B; Dos. 17, 16-22Bo; A.Bob. 3, 5-

9D; Diom. 301: 24-30; Don.mai. 624, 1-5.

90-94: Expl. 539, 36-540, 4.

93: g. 2.170.

94-96: Char. 198, 9-15B; Dos. 23, 9-15Bo; A.Bob. 6, 24-

28D; Diom. 322, 33-323, 2; Don.mai. 615, 10-11H.

96-97: Expl. 540, 4-6.

97: *Aen.* 1.617/*Aen.* 9.647.

78 utriusque numeri] *scripsi* utroque -ro *M*

79 plumbum] *M*^l

moenia] *M*^l

80 positione] *suppleui*

81 contio] *scripsi* cantio *M*

83 duali

adsignanda] *scripsi* dualia signanda *M*^l

86 duabus] *scripsi* duobus *M*

87 duabus] *scripsi* duobus *M*

88 corrupta²] *scripsi* correpta *M*

89 inexpugnabilis] *M*^l -nalis *M*

90 sunt] *De Nonno* fiunt *M*

patronymica]

scripsi -nomica *M*

91 et ea quidem] *coni. De Nonno* equidem *M*

deducuntur] *scripsi* -dicuntur *M*

retro] *Expl. (540)* reto *M*

92 lycophronem] *Expl. (540)*

lyberon *M*

sunt] *scripsi* sed *M*

93 ut¹] *Expl. (540)* aut *M*

scipiadas] *M*^l

dionymon] *scripsi* -naemon *M*

95significat] *scripsi* -cant *M*

97 et] *Expl. (540)*

eponymon] *Expl. (540)* fero- *M*

Casus nominum sunt sex: nominatiuus, genetiuius, datiuus, accusatiuus, uocatiuus, ablatiuus. Sed hi raro per omnes figuras uariantur. Quaedam nomina inueniuntur, quae per
100 casus flecti non possunt, ut ‘frugi, nequam, nihili, nugas’. Dicimus enim ‘hic nequam, <huius
nequam>, huic nequam, hunc nequam, o nequam, ab hoc nequam,’ et plurali numero similiter.
Sunt etiam alia nomina quae <per> unum casum consuetudo retineat, ut ‘sponte, tabo, natu’;
haec enim per ablatium solum in usu efferuntur. Sunt alia quae tribus tantum casibus
efferuntur: nominatiuo, accusatiuo, uocatiuo, ut ‘fas, nefas’; item pluralia, ut ‘maria, uina,
105 rura, aera, mella’. Item nomina numerorum a quattuor usque ad centum minime flectuntur;
nam ceteri numeri secundum casum et secundum genera declinantur.

Species autem in declinatione sunt quattuor eorum nominum, quae binis uocibus iuncta
declinantur. Prima eorum est, quorum prior pars non declinatur, ut ‘Hellespontus, senatus
consultum, plebis scitum’. Secunda eorum <est>, quorum prior pars declinatur, <posterior
110 uero numquam,> ut ‘tribunus plebis, praefectus equitum’. Tertia est eorum, quae
<declinantur> ex utraque parte, ut ‘Liber pater, Longa Alba, Falernum uinum’. Quarta est
eorum, quorum prior pars declinatur, posterior uero cum sit immobilis per casus, per numeros
tantum declinatur, ut ‘pater familias’ et ‘mater familias’; nam declinamus ‘huius patris
familias’ et ‘huius matris [manen] familias’ <manente> per omnes <casus> singularitatis
115 immobili secunda uoce. Nam plurali numero mutata ratione ‘horum patrum familiarum’
dicimus. Eiusdem formae sunt ‘promilite, proconsule, propraetore’, cum indiuisse
pronuntiantur; nam in pluralitate ‘his propraetoribus’ et ‘his proconsulibus’ dicimus.

Formae casuales sunt sex: senaria, quinary, quaternaria, ternaria, bipertita, simplex uel
unita. Senaria forma est quae in omnibus sex casibus uaria forma declinationis effertur, ut est
120 ‘unus, solus, nullus’; dicimus enim ‘hic unus, huius unius, huic uni, hunc unum, o une, ab hoc
uno’. Quinary forma est, cum datiuus et ablatiuus sociantur in declinationibus, <ut ‘doctus,
probus’; dicimus enim ‘huic docto’ et ‘ab hoc docto’, ceteros casus aliter. Quaternaria forma

99-100: Char. 195, 24-26B; Dos. 19, 1-2Bo; A.Bob. 4, 22-23D; Vict. 189, 19-20; Aud. 341, 17-19.
102-106: Expl. 540, 11-15; Exc.And. 246, 160-164 + 168-171DN; Diom. 309, 13-22 + 10-11.
107-117: Expl. 543, 8-21; Exc.And. 247, 172-176DN; Diom. 309, 26-37.
118-138: Expl. 544, 15-35; Char. 191, 16-192, 18B; De nom. 72, 7-26P.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 99 hi] <i>M*</i> his <i>M</i> | 100 nihili] <i>scripsi</i> nihil <i>M</i> | 100-101 huius nequam] |
| <i>suppleui</i> | 102 per] <i>Expl. (540) om. M</i> | 107 binis] <i>Expl. (543) bonis M</i> |
| iuncta] <i>M^d</i> | 109 est] <i>Expl. (543) om. M</i> | 109-110 posterior - numquam] |
| <i>Expl. (543) om. M</i> | 110 quae] <i>Expl. (543) aequalem M</i> | 111 declinantur] <i>suppl.</i> |
| <i>De Nonno</i> | quarta] <i>Expl. (543) quarto M</i> | quorum] <i>Expl. (543) quorum M</i> |
| 114 manente] <i>Expl. (543) om. M</i> | casus] <i>add. Keil (543) om. M</i> | |
| immobili] <i>Expl. (543) immobilis M</i> | 117 propraetoribus] <i>Expl. (543) -petoribus M</i> | |
| 118 bipertita] <i>M^d</i> | 119 effertur] <i>Expl. (544) efferuntur M^d</i> | 121 declinationibus] <i>M^d</i> |

est, cum nominatiuus et uocatiuus sociantur in declinationibus,> ut ‘res, spes’;dicimus enim
 ‘haec res’ et ‘o res’, ‘haec spes’ et ‘o spes’, item genetiuus et datiuus ‘huius rei’ et ‘huic rei’,
 125 ‘huius spei’ et ‘huic spei’, ceteros casus aliter. Ternaria forma est, cum nominatiuus,
 accusatiuus et uocatiuus sociantur in declinationibus, ut ‘scamnum, scrinium’, item datiuus et
 ablatiuus ‘huic scamno’ et ‘ab hoc scamno’. Non minus etiam haec forma in communibus
 nominibus ‘is’ litteris finitis est, in quibus nominatiuus, genetiuus et uocatiuus sociantur, ut
 ‘facilis, agilis’, datiuus et ablatiuus ‘huic facili’ et ‘ab hoc facili’. Bipertita forma est quae in
 130 neutralibus nominibus ‘u’ littera finitis est, in quibus nominatiuus, accusatiuus et uocatiuus
 sociantur, ut ‘genu, ueru’, nam genetiuum et datiuum et ablatiuum segregat ab his productio;
 dicimus enim ‘huius genu’, ‘huic genu’ et ‘ab hoc <genu>’. Vnita uel simplex forma est quae
 in monoptotis nominibus inuenitur, ut ‘frugi, nequam’; dicimus enim ‘hic frugi, huius frugi,
 huic frugi, hunc frugi, o frugi et ab hoc frugi’. Pluralis uero numerus aut quaternariam
 135 formam habet aut ternariam. Quaternaria forma est, cum nominatiuus et uocatiuus sociantur,
 datiuus quoque et ablatiuus similiter, ut sunt ‘docti’ et ‘probi’. Ternaria forma est, cum
 nominatiuus, accusatiuus et uocatiuus sociantur, datiuus et ablatiuus similiter, ut sunt ‘scrinia’
 et ‘parietes’.

Ablatiuus casus singularis quinque litteris uocalibus terminatur: ‘a e i o u’, exceptis
 140 pronominibus quibusdam, ut ‘ab eodem’, ‘a quodam’, ‘ab hoc’ et nominibus appellatiuis
 monoptotis, ut ‘nequam, nugas’. Quotiens autem aut ‘a’ aut ‘o’ litteris terminatus fuerit,
 totiens accepta ‘rum’ syllaba faciunt genitiuum pluralem, ut ‘ab hac toga, harum togarum’ et
 ‘ab hoc libro, horum librorum’; datiuus quoque et ablatiuus eiusdem numeri, eiusdem
 obseruationis, in ‘is’ syllabam exhibunt, ut ‘his’ et ‘ab his togis’ et ‘libris’. ‘E’ litteram in
 145 extremo habentia ablatiuo casu singulari duplicem habebunt obseruationem. Nam correpta ‘e’
 <terminata> ultimam perdunt et ‘um’ syllabam accipiunt et faciunt ex se genitiuum pluralem,
 ut ‘ab hoc pariete, horum parietum’ et ‘ab hoc hospite, horum hospitum’. Producta ‘e’
 terminata accipiunt ‘rum’ syllabam et faciunt ex se genitiuum pluralem, ut ‘ab hoc die’,

139-157: Expl. 543, 22-544, 6.

121-123 ut doctus-declinationibus] *Expl. (544)*

127 communibus] *M*^l 128 is] *Expl. (544)* his *M*

130 neutralibus] *Expl. (544)* utralibus *M*

139 ablatiuus] *scripsi* abba- *M*

141 monoptotis ut] *Expl. (543)* monoptoti sunt *M*

144 syllabam] *Keil (543)* syllaba *M*

145 correpta e] *scripsi* correpte *M*

123 est] *scripsi om. Expl. (544)*

est] *Expl. (544)* et *M*

132 genu] *Expl. (544)*

140 appellatiuis] *scripsi* -tiuus *M*

142 syllaba] *Expl. (543)* syllabam *M*

litteram] *Expl. (543)* littera *M*

146 terminata] *suppleui*

150 ‘horum dierum’ et ‘ab hac re’, ‘harum rerum’; datiuus quoque et ablatiuus eiusdem numeri, eiusdem obseruationis in ‘bus’ syllabam exhibunt, ut ‘his et ab his parietibus’ et ‘diebus’ et ‘rebus’. ‘I’ litteram in extremo habentia accepta ‘um’ syllaba faciunt genetium pluralem, ut ‘ab hoc agili’, ‘horum agilium’ et ‘ab hoc facili’, ‘horum faciliium’; datiuus quoque et ablatiuus in ‘bus’ syllabam exhibunt, ut ‘his et ab his agilibus’ et ‘facilibus’. Accusatiuo quoque in ‘is’ syllabam exhibunt, quia detracta ‘s’ littera et apposita ‘a’, neutrum genus ex se
155 facere oportet, ut ‘haec facilia’. ‘V’ litteram in extremo habentia accepta ‘um’ syllaba faciunt genetium pluralem, ut ‘ab hoc fluctu’, ‘horum fluctuum’ et ‘ab hoc partu’, ‘horum partuum’; datiuus quoque et ablatiuus in ‘bus’ syllabam exhibunt, ut ‘his et ab his fluctibus’ et ‘partubus’.

De accusatiuo plurali. ‘Has puppis, has classis, hos agilis’ accusatiuo plurali pronuntiare debemus, quoniam quae nomina ‘i’ littera terminata ablatiuo singulari acceptis ‘um’ litteris
160 faciunt genetium pluralem; eadem accusatiuo plurali in ‘is’ litteras exeunt, ut ‘ab hac puppi’, ‘harum puppium’, ‘has puppis’, et ‘ab hac turri’, ‘harum turrium’, ‘has turreis’. Sed plerumque ueteres horum nominum ablatiuum singularem ‘e’ pro ‘i’ littera terminauerunt, ut ‘*urbe Mycenae*’, et accusatiuos plurales ‘es’ pro ‘is’ litteris enuntiauerunt, ut ‘*centum urbes habitant magnas*’.

165 Ab omnibus nominibus ‘us’ litteris terminatis aduerbia ueniunt, aut <‘o’> producta, ut <‘falsus’> falso, aut ‘e’ correpta, ut ‘bonus bene’, ‘malus male’, aut ‘im’, ut ‘raptus raptim’, ‘caesus caesim’, aut ‘um’, <ut> ‘horrendus horrendum’, ‘magnus magnum’.

158-164: Expl. 545, 1-9.
163-164: *Aen.* 3.106.

149 eiusdem] *M*^l
syllaba] *Keil* (543) syllabam *M*
facili *M*
synlabam *M** symlabam *M*
scripsi portubus *M*
(545) accepta *M*
163 mycenae] *scripsi* michenae *M*
enuntiauerunt] *scripsi* littera renuntiauerunt *M*
165 o] *suppleui*
im] *scripsi* m *M*

161-164: Probus apud Gel. 13.21.
165-167: Char. 237, 14-17B.

151 litteram] *Keil* (543) littera *M*
153 agilibus] *Expl.* (544) agillibus *M*
155 litteram] *scripsi* littera *M*
156 fluctuum] *scripsi* fluctum *M*
159 quae] *De Nonno* quem *M*
162 ablatiuum singularem] *corr. Keil* (545) ablatiuo singulari *M*
es pro is] *scripsi* e pro s *M*
166 falsus] *suppleui*
167 ut] *suppleui*

162-163: *Aen.* 5.52.

facilibus] *scripsi*
syllaba] *Expl.* (544)
157 partubus]
acceptis] *Expl.*
litteris
ut²] *Expl.* (545) et *M*
bene] *scripsi* bone *M*

X DE PRONOMINE

Pronomen est pars orationis, quae pro ipso posita nomine minus quidem plene idem tamen significat. Nam cum debeam dicere: ‘artem Scaurus scripsit’, dico: ‘artem ille scripsit’,
5 et pro ‘artem Scaurus scripsisti’ dico: ‘artem tu scripsisti.’ Pronomini accidunt qualitas, genus, numerus, figura, persona, casus.

Qualitatis species sunt duae: finita et infinita, finita est quae notat certum numerum certamque personam, ut ‘ego, tu, ille’, infinita est quae cuilibet personae potest applicari, ut ‘quis, quantus, qualis’.

10 Item aut praepositiva sunt pronomina, ut ‘quis’, aut subiunctiva, ut ‘is’, aut communia, ut ‘talis, qualis’.

Genera pronominibus ita ut nominibus adiunguntur; nam aut masculina sunt pronomina, ut ‘quis’, aut feminina, ut ‘quae’, aut neutra, ut ‘quod’. Sunt etiam communia pronomina generibus aut duobus, feminina scilicet et neutra, ut ‘quae’, aut omnibus tribus, ut ‘ego’.

15 Numerus pronominibus accidit uterque; singularis, ut ‘qualis’, pluralis, ut ‘quales’. Communis quoque numerus inuenitur, ut ‘qui, quae’; dicimus enim ‘qui uir’ et ‘qui uiri’, ‘quae mulier’ et ‘quae mulieres’.

Figura pronominum duplex est: aut enim simplicia sunt pronomina, ut ‘quis, ego’, aut composita, ut ‘quisquis, egomet’.

20 Personae pronominibus accidunt tres: prima, ut ‘ego’ uel ‘mihi’, secunda, ut ‘tu’ uel ‘tibi’, tertia, ut ‘ille’ uel ‘sibi’.

Casus pronominibus ita ut nominibus adiunguntur, ut ‘hic uel haec uel hoc, huius, huic, hunc hanc uel hoc, o, ab hoc et ab hac’; et pluraliter: ‘hi uel hae uel haec, horum harum, his, hos has haec, o, ab his’.

X, 3-4: Char. 200, 9-10B; Dos. 27, 2-4Bo; A.Bob. 39, 26-27D; Aud. 343, 9-10; Inst.Art. 131, 2-3; Aug. III §1W; Expl. 545, 21-22. **5-6:** Don.mai. 629, 3-4H; Char. 200, 10-11B; A.Bob. 39, 27-40, 1D; Dos. 27, 4-5Bo; Aud. 343, 10-11; Expl. 545, 23. **7-9:** Char. 200, 12-15B; Dos. 27, 5-8Bo; A.Bob. 40, 2-4D; Expl. 545, 24-26; Diom. 329, 5-10. **10-11:** Don.mai. 629, 8-9H; Diom. 329, 20-22; Asper 551, 2-3. **15-17:** Char. 200, 18-20B; 14-16; Dos. 27, 12-14Bo; Ars Bob. 40, 9-11D; Don.mai. 630, 6-8H; Diom. 329, 14-16; Aud. 343, 19-22. **18-19:** Don.mai. 630 10-11H; Dos. 27, 10-12Bo; A.Bob. 40, 7-8D; Diom. 329, 16-18; Char. 200, 17-18B; Expl. 546, 1-3; Aud. 343, 22-23; Asper 551, 3-4. **20-21:** Char. 200, 22-23. **22-24:** A.Bob. 40, 12-13D.

X, 3 ipso] *Law (73) ipsa M*
eidem *M* 4 scripsit] *M'*
scripsisti] *Law (73) scripsit M*

plene] *Law (73) plena est M*
5 scaurus] *Law (73) scarus M*
8 -que] *Expl. (545) om. M*

idem] *Law (73)*

25 Nullum autem pronomen recipit conparationem, quamuis <et qualitatem significet et
quantitatem> [ut qualis talis aut quantitate ut quantus tantus], et in locum nominis successerit,
ut ‘pulcher, decens’, fit enim ‘pulchrior, <decentior>’. Nam aut rem significat, ut ‘hoc,
illud’; aut gentem, ut ‘cuias, nostras’; aut ordinem, ut ‘quotus, totus’; aut numerum, ut ‘quot,
tot’; <aut qualitatem, ut ‘qualis, talis’; aut quantitatem, ut ‘quantus, tantus’;> aut <ad> aliquid
30 dictum, quod apud Graecos τὼν πρὸς τί <dictum est ex his quae ad aliquid referuntur,> ut
‘meus, tuus’. †quod non sola comparari in nominibus† [dictum est ex his quae ad aliquid
feruntur]

Pronomina aut utraque significatione singularia sunt, ut ‘meus, tuus’, aut altera tantum
pluralia, ut ‘mei, tui’, aut utraque significatione [non] pluralia, ut ‘nostri, uestri’.

35 Quaedam pronomina confunduntur cum aduerbiis, ut ‘qui potuit’ cum dicimus †ita ut
nomina quaeque dicimus curae est cordi est mihi†.

25-31: Diom. 329, 22- 26; Aud. 343, 26-30; Asper 550, 29-35. 33-34: Don.mai. 630, 8-9H;
Char. 205, 7-11B; Diom. 329, 24-28.

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 25-26 et - qualitatem] <i>suppleui</i> | 26 ut - tantus] <i>deleui</i> | et] <i>scripsi</i> nisi <i>M</i> |
| 27 decentior] <i>suppleui</i> | 28 aut gentem] <i>scripsi</i> audientem <i>M</i> | |
| cuias] <i>scripsi</i> cuiā <i>M</i> | nostras] <i>scripsi</i> nostra <i>M</i> | 29 aut qualitatem - tantus] |
| <i>suppleui</i> | ad] <i>suppleui</i> | 30 τὼν πρὸς τί] ton prosti <i>M</i> |
| dictum - refereruntur] <i>suppleui</i> | 31 quod] <i>M'</i> | non sola] <i>M'</i> |
| 31-32 dictum - feruntur] | 34 pluralia] <i>M'</i> | utraque] <i>M'</i> |
| significatione] <i>scripsi</i> significatio <i>M</i> | | |

XI DE VERBO

Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu. Verbo accidunt qualitas,
<genus,> modus, numerus, figura, coniugatio, persona, tempus.

5 Qualitas uerborum aut finita est aut infinita: finita est quae notat certum numerum,
<certum tempus,> certam personam, ut ‘lego, scribo’; infinita est quae minime certum habet,
ut ‘legere, scribere’. Haec enim omnibus numeris, temporibus, personis infinita sunt; ceterum
‘legisse, scripsisse’ dicuntur quidem infinita, sed tempore solo finita sunt.

10 Genera uerborum sunt quinque: actiuum, passiuum, neutrum, commune, deponens,
quod et simplex dicitur. Actiuum est quod ‘o’ littera terminatur et accepta ‘r’ littera facit
passiuum, ut ‘lego, scribo’; passiuum facit, ut ‘legor, scribor’. Passiuum est quod ‘r’ littera
terminatur et deposita eadem littera redit ad actiuum, ut ‘lego, scribo’. Neutrum est quod in
‘o’ litteram cadit et ‘r’ numquam recipit, ut ‘nato, curro, cogito’. Commune est quod ‘r’ littera
15 terminatur et utriusque uerbi significationem habet, ut ‘criminator, consolor’; dicimus enim
‘criminator te’ et ‘criminator a te’, ‘consolor te’ et ‘consolor a te’. Simplex est quod in ‘r’ litteram
exit neque amittit eandem, ut ‘luctor, conuiuior’.

Haec autem quinque generum species per septem, quos subiecimus, modos
declinabuntur. Nam modi sunt septem: indicatiuus, imperatiuus, promissiuius, optatiuus,
coniunctiuus, infinitus, impersonalis; indicatiuus, ut ‘lego’, imperatiuus, ut ‘lege’, promissiuius,
20 ut ‘legam’, optatiuus, ut ‘utinam legerem’, coniunctiuus, ut ‘cum legam’ uel ‘si legam’,
infinitus, ut ‘legere’, impersonalis, ut ‘legitur’, quod est passiuo simile. Praeter haec sunt alia,
ut ‘sedetur, itur, uidetur’. Non [pro] minus et illa apud quosdam impersonalia dicuntur, ut
‘taedet, pudet, paenitet’.

25 Numeri uerborum accidunt duo: singularis et pluralis; singularis, ut ‘scribo’, pluralis ut
‘scribimus’. Sunt etiam numero communia, ut ‘legere, facere’, quae similiter et in personis
communis sunt. Item aut semel quid factum uerba significant, ut ‘lego’, aut saepius, ut ‘lecto’
aut semper, ut ‘lectito’.

XI, 3: Aug. IV §1W; Serv. 411, 14; Expl. 502, 26-27. **5-8:** Char. 209, 28-210, 2B; A.Bob. 47, 11-17D; Vict. 197, 24-198, 3; Cons. 374, 1-3. **9-16:** Char. 210, 3-6B; Don.mai. 635, 5-636, 5H. **17-21:** Don.mai. 632, 8-633, 4H. **21-23:** Char. 210, 6-8B.
26-27: Char. 214, 23-25B; A.Bob. 49, 20-21D.

XI, 3 qualitas] *M*^l qualitate *M*
5 certum] *M*^l certam *M*
10 simplex] *scripsi* simile *M*
item *M* 24 pluralis²] *M*^l

4 genus] *suppleui* persona] *M** personae *M*
6 certum tempus] *suppleui* 7 infinita] *scripsi* finita *M*
21 passiuo] *Luhtala* participio *M* 22 itur] *scripsi*
26 item] *scripsi* ita *M*

Figura uerborum duplex est: aut enim simplicia sunt uerba, ut ‘scribo’, aut composita, ut ‘describo’. Conponuntur autem uerba, ita ut nomina, modis quattuor: aut ex duabus integris, aut ex duabus corruptis, aut ex integra et corrupta, aut ex corrupta et integra.

Personae in uerbis sunt tres: prima a qua sermo est, ut ‘scribo’, secunda ad quam sermo est, ut ‘scribis’, tertia de qua sermo est, ut ‘scribit’.

Tempora uerbis accidunt tria: praesens, praeteritum, futurum; praesens, ut ‘lego’, praeteritum, ut ‘legi’, futurum, ut ‘legam’. Praeteriti temporis differentiae sunt tres: aut praeteritum perfectum, ut ‘legi’, aut praeteritum imperfectum figurae inchoatiuae, ut ‘legebam’, aut praeteritum plusquamperfectum figurae recordatiuae, ut ‘legeram’.

Coniugationes quas Graeci συζυγίας appellant sunt apud nos tres: prima, secunda, tertia. Hae dinoscuntur in uerbis actiuis et neutralibus. Primae coniugationis uerba indicatiuo modo tempore praesenti ad secundam personam ‘as’ litteris terminantur, ut ‘amo amas’, ‘canto cantas’. Secundae coniugationis uerba indicatiuo modo tempore praesenti ad secundam personam ‘es’ litteris terminantur, ut ‘doceo doces’, ‘moneo mones’. Tertiae coniugationis uerba indicatiuo modo tempore praesenti ad secundam personam ‘is’ interdum correpte, interdum producte terminantur: correpte, ut ‘lego legis’, ‘peto petis’, producte, ut ‘eo is’, ‘nutrio nutris’, quae tamen a quibusdam quarta dicitur, sed ab aliis tertia melius existimatur.

De uerbis inchoatiuis. Sunt uerba quae praeteritum tempus non habent, eaque fere in ‘sco’ litteras exeunt et appellantur inchoatiua, ut ‘tepesco, feruesco’; ‘ferui’ enim et ‘calui’ ab his ueniunt, quae sunt ‘ferueo’ et ‘caleo’. Haec autem species uerborum ab his deducitur, quae ‘o’ littera indicatiuo finiuntur, ut ‘horreo horresco’, ‘tepeo tepesco’. Quae ideo non habent praeteritum perfectum, quoniam hae uoces inchoatam actionem, non perfectam, significant.

Quorundam inchoatiuorum primae positionis uerba in usu habemus, ut ‘tepesco, feruesco, pallesco’; dicimus enim ‘tepeo, paleo, ferueo’. ‘Albesco’ autem et ‘iuuenesco’ frequentamus, nec tamen horum primae positionis uerba in usu habemus. Nam Vergilius figurauit cum ait, ‘*campique ingentes ossibus alben*’. ‘Iuueneo’ et ‘seneo’ non dicimus, olim

28-30: Don.mai. 637, 6-9H; Diom. 335, 9-13; Sac. 432, 3-6; Vict. 198, 20-23; Aud. 346, 26-29.
 31-32: A.Bob. 49, 18-19D. 33-36: Don.mai. 637, 12-638, 1H; A.Bob. 49, 11-15D; Vict. 199, 24-26; Aud. 347, 1-3; Asper 551, 25-26. 37-44: Char. 225. 25-226, 10B.
 45-49: Char. 329, 26 -30B. 50-55: Char. 330, 8-16B; Diom. 344, 2-10. 53: Aen. 12.36.

30 ex²] *M^l om. M* uerbis] *scripsi uerbiis M* 37 συζυγίας] *scripsi synzigias M*
 40 indicatiuo modo] *scripsi indicatiui modi M* 42 indicatiuo modo] *scripsi indicatiui modi M*
 correpte] *scripsi corpepte M* 44 aliis] *scripsi his M* 47 deducitur] *scripsi*
 deducitur *M* indicatiuo] *scripsi indicatiuus M* finiuntur] *scripsi finitur M*
 49 uoces] *scripsi uocales M* inchoatam actionem] *De Nonno inchoationem M*
 51 ferueo] *scripsi caleo M* alben] *scripsi albeni M* iuueneo] *scripsi in- M*
 seneo] *scripsi sedeo M*

quidem ‘seneo’ dicebatur, unde Catullus tertia persona ‘senet’ dixit, ut ‘*nunc recondita / senet quiete*’.

De uerbis defectiuus. Sunt uerba quae in declinatione deficiunt et ideo defectiua <dicuntur>, eaque fere in ‘i’ littera exeunt, ut ‘odi, noui, memini, coepi, pepigi’, aut in ‘o’, ut ‘soleo, fido, fio, meto, audeo, gaudeo’.

Defectiua autem uerba tribus modis fiunt, quotiens aut figura mutantur, ut ‘refero refers refert’, ‘rettuli rettulisti rettulit’, ‘referebam’ et ‘rettuleram’; per qualitates, ut ‘fio factus sum’, ‘soleo solitus sum’; per tempora, ut ‘memini meministi meminit’, de hinc ‘memineram memineras memineras’, quae in pronuntiatiuo <modo solo inueniuntur>.

Sunt uerba quae a simili praesenti uenientia in praeterito perfecto in diuersas partes declinationis separantur, ut ‘pando’ facit ‘pandi’ et ‘pandaui’, et ‘sero’ facit ‘serui’ et ‘seraui’. Item contraria <quae> a <diuersis> praesentibus uenientia in praeterito perfecto similia faciunt, ut ‘lugeo’ <et ‘luceo’> faciunt ‘luxi’, et ‘cerno’ et ‘cresco’ faciunt ‘creui’.

54-55: 4.25-26
27DN.

56-58: Expl. 557, 4-6.
63-66: Expl. 557, 11-16.

59-62: Expl. 557, 6-11; Exc.And. 242, 25-

57: dicuntur] Expl. (557) om. M memini] Expl. (557) nemini M coepi] M'
aut] Expl. (557) ut M 60 qualitates] M' 62 modo - inueniuntur] Expl. (557) om. M
63 sunt - simili] Expl. (557) om. M praesenti] suppleui pronuntiatiuo Expl. (557)
65 quae] Expl. (557) om. M diuersis] Expl. (557) om. M 66 et] suppleui
luceo] Expl. (557) om. M faciunt¹] scripsi facit M faciunt²] scripsi facit et M

XII DE PARTICIPIO

Participium est pars orationis, quae per se quidem nihil ualet, nisi a nomine et a uerbo partem acceperit. Nam participium dictum <est>, quod partem nominis, partem uerbi capiat.
5 Trahit enim a nomine genus et casum, a uerbo significationem et tempus, ab utroque numerum et figuram.

Genera participiis accidunt omnia: masculinum, ut ‘hic factus’, femininum, ut ‘haec facta’, neutrum, ut ‘hoc factum’; subiunctis scilicet omnibus casibus suis.

Significatio participiorum, ita ut uerborum, in species diuiditur quinque: nam participia
10 ueniunt a uerbo actiuo duo: instantis temporis et futuri, instantis, ut ‘legens’, futuri, ut ‘lecturus’; a passiuo duo: temporis praeteriti et plusquamfuturi, <praeteriti, ut ‘lectus’, plusquamfuturi, ut> ‘legendus’; a neutro uero duo: instantis temporis et futuri, instantis ‘uigilans’, futuri ‘uigilaturus’; a communi quattuor: temporis instantis, futuri, praeteriti, plusquamfuturi, instantis, ut ‘criminans’, futuri ‘criminaturus’, praeteriti ‘criminatus’,
15 plusquamfuturi ‘criminandus’; a simplici, id est a deponenti, tria: instantis temporis, futuri, et praeteriti, instantis ‘conuiuans’, futuri ‘conuiuaturus’, praeteriti ‘conuiuatus’.

Sed cum haec ita sint, consuetudo nonnumquam actiuum et neutrum cum passiuo confundit, ut ‘potus sum’ cum dicimus et ‘natandus est fluuius’, et nonnumquam passiuum in actiuum transfigurat, ut ‘annus uertens’, ‘terra mouens’.

20 Sunt quaedam participia eadem et nomina, ut ‘cultus, uisus’, sed participia ‘huius culti’, ‘huius uisi’ faciunt genetiuo singulari, cum sunt nomina ‘huius cultus’, ‘huius uisus’ faciunt.

Numeri participiis accidunt duo: singularis, ut ‘hic currens’, pluralis, ut ‘hi currentes’. Item aut semel quid agi participia significant, ut ‘legens, currens’, aut saepius, ut ‘lectitans, cursitans’.

XII, 4-6: Char. 232, 11-13B; Dos. 38, 4-7Bo; Inst.Art. 138, 27-30.
9Bo. **20-21:** Don.mai. 646, 5-6H; Aug. VI §2W.

7-8: Dos. 38, 7-
22-24: Char. 231, 4-7B.

4 est] *suppleui*

5 casum] *scripsi casus M*

7 omnia] *scripsi nomina M*

9 significatio] *scripsi significationes M*

10 actiuo] *M* accusatiuo M*

11 et] *M* om. M*

11-12 praeteriti - ut] *suppleui*

17 sint] *scripsi sit M*

22 ut¹] *scripsi cum M*

25 Figura participiorum duplex est: simplex, ut ‘legens’, composita, ut ‘perlegens’.
Conponuntur autem participia modis quattuor, quibus et nomina et uerba conponi supra
diximus.

 Sunt quaedam participia, quae solui in formas uerborum non possunt, ut ‘togatus,
galeatus, hastatus’. Quae Varro et Laberius participia esse affirmantes sic dicunt: sunt
30 tamquam ‘armatus’ <et> ‘aptatus’, quae a uerbis ueniunt. Sed cum partem a uerbo talia non
habeant, non recte participia dicuntur.

25-27: Don.mai. 645, 11-12H.

28-31: Char. 232, 21-24B; Dos. 38, 17-19Bo.

28 formas] *Law* (83) formans *M*

29 sunt] *scripsi* ut *M*

30 et] *suppleui*

XIII DE ADVERBIO

Aduerbum est pars orationis, quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat aut mutat. Aduerbia aut suae positionis sunt, aut ab aliis transeunt; aut a se nascuntur, <ut> ‘heri, nuper’, <aut> ab aliis transeunt, ut ‘docte, sapienter’: a ‘docto’ enim et ‘sapienti’ ueniunt.

Aduerbio accidunt significatio, comparatio, figura.

Significationis species sunt multae: aut enim tempus aliae significant, ut ‘hodie, cras, nunc, nuper, modo, antea, perendie’; aut locum, ut ‘hic, illic, ubi, ibi’; aut numerum, ut ‘semel, bis, ter, decies’; aut negationem, ut ‘non, haud, nequaquam, numquam’; aut affirmationem, ut ‘etiam, enimvero, <quidni>’; aut demonstrationem, ut ‘en, ecce, eccillud’; aut hortationem, ut ‘age, heia, macte’; aut optationem, ut ‘utinam, uelim’; aut ordinem, ut ‘deinde, deinceps, inde’; aut qualitatem, ut ‘bene, male, frigide, pessime’; aut quantitatem, ut ‘plus, satis, nimium, parum, abunde, large, plene, uaste’; aut interrogationem, ut ‘cur, quid ita, [quinni], quidnam, quare’; aut similitudinem, ut ‘ceu, quasi, ueluti, sicuti’; aut dubitationem, ut ‘fortasse, forsitan’; aut personalia, ut ‘mecum, tecum, nobiscum, uobiscum, quicum, equidem’; aut communicationem, ut ‘simul, pariter, una’; aut inuocationem, ut ‘heus’; aut responsionem, ut ‘heu’; aut prohibitionem, ut ‘ne’; aut separationem, ut ‘seorsum’; aut confirmationem, ut ‘etiam, uero, plane’; aut iurationem, ut ‘edepol, mehercule, medius fidius’; aut admirationem, ut ne o quam†; aut conparationem, ut ‘magis, potius’; aut euentum, ut ‘forte’; aut †concessionem ut ita nec sic intere†; aut finitionem, ut ‘hactenus, dumtaxat’.

Sunt quaedam aduerbia, quae ornatua recte dicuntur, nam adposita orationem inluminant, ablata nihil sensui detrahunt, ut ‘profecto, tandem, dum, locorum, gentium, terrarum’, ut apud †lucidum opinor† <***>

XIII, 3-4: Char. 233, 2-3B; 241, 21-22B; 246, 19-21B; Diom. 403, 16-18; Don.mai. 640, 2-3H; Ps.Aug. 113, 2-4Ma; Expl. 558, 1-2. **4-5:** Char. 233, 3-6B; Dos. 39, 3-5Bo; Ps.Aug. 113, 6-8Ma; Vict. 201, 15-18; Aud. 347, 25-27; Sac. 443, 5-6. **6:** Char. 234, 1-2B; 233, 6-7B; Dos. 39, 5-6Bo; Don.mai. 641, 8H; Diom. 404, 3; Vict. 201, 18-19; Aud. 348, 6; Sac. 442, 17; Ps.Aug. 113, 5Ma. Expl. 558, 2-3. **7-20:** Char. 233, 7-17B. **21-23:** Expl. 558, 19-23; Vict. 202, 5-10.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 4 ut] <i>suppleui</i> | 5 aut] <i>suppleui</i> | 6 figura] <i>scripsi</i> figura <i>M</i> |
| 9 haud] <i>scripsi</i> aut <i>M</i> | numquam] <i>scripsi</i> neumquam <i>M</i> | 10 quidni] |
| <i>suppleui</i> | demonstrationem] <i>M</i> ^l | 11 optationem] |
| <i>M</i> ^l optionem <i>M</i> | 14 quinni] <i>deleui</i> | quidnam] <i>scripsi</i> quinam <i>M</i> |
| 18 confirmationem] <i>scripsi</i> conparationem <i>M</i> | edepol] <i>scripsi</i> ede polle <i>M</i> | |
| mehercule] <i>scripsi</i> hercule <i>M</i> | 21 adposita] <i>scripsi</i> napposita <i>M</i> | 22 profecto] |
| <i>scripsi</i> profecto <i>M</i> | dum] <i>M</i> ^l ut uid. | locorum] <i>scripsi</i> |
| loquar <i>M</i> | | |

25 Aduerbia loci aut definitam significationem habent, ut ‘hic, illic, ibi, ubi’, aut infinitam,
ut ‘supra, ultra, citra’. Aduerbia temporis aut definita sunt, ut ‘heri, hodie’, aut infinita, ut
‘frequenter, cottidie’.

Conparationem recipiunt aduerbia quotiens appellationes unde transeunt comparantur, ut
‘docte, doctius, doctissime’, quia est ‘doctus, doctior, doctissimus’.

30 Figura in aduerbiis, sicut in omnibus partibus orationis, aut simplex est, ut ‘iuste’, aut
composita, ut ‘iniuste’.

Aduerbiis omnibus praepositio separatim adici non debet.

27-28: Char. 233, 20-22B; Dos. 41, 3-5Bo; Diom. 405, 20-22; Vict. 202, 14-16.

29-30: Char. 233, 18-19B; Dos. 41, 1-3Bo; Diom. 408, 8-9; Vict. 202, 12-14.

31: Char. 233, 22-23B; Dos. 41, 6-7Bo.

31 separatim] *M*^d

XIV DE PRAEPOSITIONE

Praepositio est pars orationis, quae praeposita alii parti orationis significationem eius inplet aut mutat, ut scribo, subscribo, describo.

5 Praepositiones aut casibus seruiunt aut loquellis: [aut] casibus tantum, ut ‘apud, penes’, ut ‘apud deos’, ‘penes homines’; loquellis tantum, ut ‘am, con, re, se, di, dis’, ut ‘ambio, concedo, refero, secedo, dilato, dissentio’. Ceterae praepositiones et uerbis cohaerent et casibus, ut ‘perfer’, ‘per hunc’, ‘admoue’, ‘ad urbem’.

10 Quae uero casibus seruiunt, aliae accusatiuum, aliae ablatiuium casum trahunt, aliae sunt in utroque communes.

Accusatiui casus sunt hae: ‘per, apud, aduersus, uls, ad, usque, pone, supra, contra, <cis>, citra, ultra, subtus, prope, iuxta, circum, ob, ante, secundum, praeter, propter, infra, intra, circa, extra, post, inter, erga, secus, clam, trans, <penes>’; ut ‘per hominem, apud grammaticum, aduersus leges, uls prouinciam, ad amicum, usque Romam, pone fores, supra legem, contra ius, cis Galliam, citra sedem, ultra familias, subtus iugum, prope finem, iuxta montem, circum portum, ob iniuriam, ante aedes, secundum mare, [trans flumen], praeter spem, propter aquam, infra annum, intra locum, circa rationem, extra hostem, post annum, inter domos, erga rem <publicam>, secus portum, clam uxorem, trans montem, penes amicum’. Ablatiui casus sunt hae: ‘a, ab, abs, <absque>, de, e, ex, pro, prae, cum, sine, tenus, coram, palam; ut ‘a solo, ab urbe, <***>, absque pudore, de domo, e portu, ex ordine, pro iure, prae uirtute, cum socio, sine fide, tenus crure, coram patre, palam filio’.

‘In’ autem et ‘sub’ et ‘subter’ utrique pariter casui seruiunt: cum in loco [rem] significare uolumus, ablatiuo, cum ad locum, accusatiuo, ut ‘in foro sum’ et ‘in forum eo’, ‘sub tecto sum’ et ‘sub tectum fugio’, item ‘subter aqua sum’ et ‘subter aquam uenio’.

XIV, 3-4: Char. 298, 2-5B; Dos. 45, 2-4Bo; Don.mai. 648, 4-5H; Vict. 203, 16-18.

5-8: Expl. 561, 20-24; Char. 298, 5-10B; 308, 3-8B; Diom. 409, 23-27.

9-10: Expl. 561,

24-25; Char. 298, 10-12B; Diom. 409, 27-28.

11-21: Expl. 562, 1-13.

22-24: Expl. 562, 13-16.

3 alii parti] *scripsi* aliis partibus *M*

11 aduersus] *M*^l

12 cis] *Expl. (562) om. M*

ab *M*

14 uls] *Expl. (562) cis M*

deleui

crure] *Keil (562) cruce M*

13 inter] *Expl. (562) intra M*

18 publicam] *Expl. (562) om. M*

22 rem] *del. Keil (562)*

5 aut] *deleui*

uls] *Expl. (562) cis M*

subtus] *Expl. (562) M^l subtus M*

pone] *Expl. (562) pedes M*

penes *M^l*

21 cum] *Expl. (562) con M*

23 accusatiuo] *M^l*

8 perfer] *Expl. (561) prefert M*

pone] *Expl. (562) penes M*

ob] *Expl. (562)*

penes] *Expl. (562) om. M*

16 trans flumen]

21 cum] *Expl. (562) con M*

23 accusatiuo] *M^l*

25 ‘Super’ autem si locum significat, [hoc est] accusatiuo iungere debemus, ut ‘*at Lausum socii exanimem super arma ferebant*’, hoc est ‘supra arma’. Si uero ‘de’ particulam significare uolumus, seruiet ablatiuo, ut ‘*multa super Priamo rogitans, super Hectore multa*’, id est ‘de Priamo’ et ‘de Hectore’.

30 ‘In’ praepositio quando [locum] alii parti orationis praeponitur, dupliciter ac diuerse ualet, aut enim auget positiuae uocis significationem, ut ‘inponens, instans’, aut derogat, ut ‘inmitis, infelix’.

‘In’ et ‘con’ syllabae [sequentes infelix syllabae] sequentibus <‘s’> uel <‘f’> litteris producuntur, <‘ut infelix’, sequentibus> ceteris omnibus corripuntur.

XV DE CONIUNCTIONE

Coniunctio est pars orationis conectens ordinansque sententiam. Coniunctioni accidunt potestas, figura, ordo.

5 Potestas coniunctionum in quinque species diuiditur. Sunt enim aliae copulatiuae, aliae disiunctiuae, aliae expletiuae, aliae causales, aliae rationales: copulatiuae sunt hae: ‘et, at, atque, que, [immo], ast, ac’; disiunctiuae: ‘aut, ue, uel, ne, nec, neque’; expletiuae: ‘quidem, equidem, quoque, autem, tamen, porro’; causales: ‘si, etsi, etiam, etiamsi, [sed], sitamen, siquidem, quando, quandoquidem, quin, quinetiam, sinetiam, siue, seu, sin, nam, namque,

10 <ni>, nisi, nisisi, enim, etenim, sed, praeterea quamobrem, praesertim, quamquam, quamuis, proinde, saltem, uidelicet, item, itemque, ceterum, alioquin, propterea, sane’; rationales: ‘ergo, igitur, ita, itaque, enim, enimuero, quia, quapropter, quippe, quoniam, quoniamquidem, ideo, idcirco, scilicet, quatenus’.

25-26: *Aen.* 10.841. 27: *Aen.* 1.750. 32-33: *Vict.* 204, 15-16.
 XV, 3-4: *Diom.* 415, 16-17 + 23-24; *Char.* 289, 19-21B; *Dos.* 52, 2-3Bo; *Don.mai.* 646, 14-15H;
Inst.Art. 143, 23-25; *Ps.Aug.* 123, 8-10Ma; *Vict.* 202, 21-22; *Aud.* 340, 10-11; *Sac.* 444, 22-23; *Aug.*
 VII, §1W; *Asper* 553, 9-11. 5-13: *Expl.* 560, 20-28.

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|
| 25 at] <i>scripsi</i> ad <i>M</i> | 29 locum] <i>deleui</i> | alii parti] <i>scripsi</i> alia parte <i>M</i> |
| praeponitur] <i>scripsi</i> ponitur <i>M</i> | | diuerse] <i>scripsi</i> diuersa <i>M</i> |
| 32 sequentes - syllabae] <i>deleui</i> | s] <i>suppleui</i> | f] <i>suppleui</i> |
| 33 ut - sequentibus] <i>suppleui</i> | | |
| XVI, 6 rationales] <i>scripsi</i> rationes <i>M</i> | | 7 que] <i>scripsi</i> quin <i>M</i> |
| immo] <i>deleui</i> immo <i>M</i> ^l imme <i>M</i> | 8 sed] <i>deleui</i> | 10 ni] <i>Expl.</i> (560) om. <i>M</i> |
| 11 item itemque] <i>Expl.</i> (560) ita itaque <i>M</i> | | |

15 Figura est qua apparet [si] simplicesne sint coniunctiones an conpositae: simplices, <ut>
'quoniam, quidem, quando'; conpositae, ut 'quoniamquidem, equidem, quandoquidem'.

Ordo est quo apparet quae praeponi tantum possint, ut 'nam, equidem, [igitur]', quae
subiungi tantum, ut 'enim, <que,> autem', quae uero praeponi et subiungi, ut 'et, <igitur>'.

Quaedam autem coniunctiones, ita ut praepositiones, cum aduerbiis confunduntur, ut
'quando, enim, ante, post'.

XVI DE INTERIECTIONE

5 Interiectio est pars orationis [animi motum] animi affectum significans. Vario autem
affectu mouemur: nam aut laetamur, ut 'ua', aut dolemus, ut 'heu', aut laudamus, ut 'euax',
aut admiramur, ut 'papae', aut exclamamus, ut 'heus', aut animaduertimus, ut 'attat', aut
ridiculi animaduersionem exprimimus, ut 'bombax'.

10 Apud Plautum sunt quaedam partes orationis pro interiectionibus positae. <Nam et
Vergilius sic posuit,> ut '*sequiturque, nefas, Aegyptia coniux*', - 'nefas' hic enim interiectio
est - et '*pecudesque locutae, infandum*'. Item 'pro dolor' et 'pro pudor' cum dicimus et siqua
sunt similia.

14-15: Expl. 560, 28-30; Char. 289, 21-23B; Dos. 52, 2-5Bo; Ps.Aug. 123, 11-12Ma; Vict. 202, 22-24; Sac. 446, 19-20. **16-17:** Expl. 560, 30-561, 1; Char. 289, 23-290, 1B; Dos. 52, 5-7Bo; Ps.Aug. 123, 13-14Ma; Vict. 202, 24-203, 2; Aud. 350, 9-11; Inst.Art. 144, 22-23; Aug. VII, §4W.

18-19: Expl. 561, 1-2.

XVI, 3: Char. 311, 4-5B; 311, 14-15B; Dos. 64, 2Bo; Vict. 204, 20; Asper 557, 13; Expl. 562, 19.

3-6: Expl. 562, 19-21; Char. 311, 5-8B; Dos. 64, 3-5Bo.

204, 23-205, 1.

8: Aen. 8.688.

7-10: Expl. 562, 22-25; Vict.

9: g. 1.478-9.

14 si] *deleui*

17 que] *Expl. (560) om. M*

(560) antea *M*

XVI, 7-8 nam - posuit] *Expl. (562) om. M*

pudor] *scripsi dudor M*

ut] *Expl. (560) om. M*

igitur] *suppleui*

16] *igitur] deleui*

19 ante] *Expl.*

9 item] *Expl. (560) ita M*

3.1 De arte

The *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* (APS) begins abruptly with the heading *de arte*, following another grammatical text. According to several Late Latin grammarians, *artes grammaticae* could begin in a variety of ways: for instance, with a discussion of the concept of *ars*, *uox*, or *littera*, with a discussion on inflection or case, or with a discussion on the parts of speech.¹ As the APS begins so abruptly, without a title or preface of any kind, we cannot be certain, based on the evidence in the manuscript alone, that it actually did begin with a discussion on *ars*. However, a mention in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius suggests that it indeed began with a chapter on *ars* (see below), and, as mentioned by Diomedes *et alii* in their discussions, such a beginning was certainly not uncommon in Latin grammars. Other extant grammars that begin with a discussion on *ars* include, for instance, those of Ps.-Asper, Victorinus, and Audax.

The chapter begins with a semantic definition of *ars* ('a branch of learning'), followed by an etymological definition.² In the *Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology*, Samantha Schad (2007: s.v. *ars*) organizes the extant definitions of *ars* into two types, those she sees as deriving from Scaurus'³ grammar and those attributable to Cicero and Ariston. Indeed, the following definition of *ars* is attributed to Scaurus in the preface to book 1 of the *Explanationes*: "*Scaurus vero hinc coepit, ars est cuiusque rei scientia usu vel traditione suscepta, quia artem doctrina vel usu cotidiano percipimus*" (GL 4: 486, 9–11).⁴ The definition transmitted in the *Explanationes* is the closest to that preserved in the APS, the main difference being the use of the verb *suscipere* by Ps.-Sergius, instead of the verb *percipere*. The beginning of the definition of *ars* in Diomedes'

¹ Some Late Latin grammarians discuss this issue, and a few also come to a conclusion as regards the best way to begin a grammar. See Diomedes, for instance: "*Artis grammaticae auctores exordium scribendi varium diversumque sumpserunt. quidam enim ab ipsa arte coeperunt, alii ab elementis vel a litteris, multi a casibus, plerique a partibus orationis, non nulli a voce, pauci a nominum declinatione; nos vero ab ipsa oratione auspicemur*" (GL 1: 300, 3–6). See also Victorinus: "*Vnde incipere debet grammatica? Quidam [etiam] a voce coeperunt, alii a litteris, alii a syllabis, alii a casibus, nos autem a definitione. Qui tamen coeperunt melius? Vtique qui a definitione vel a litteris. nam vox naturalis est et sine grammatica communis cum imperitis*" (GL 6: 188, 3–6) (cf. with Audax GL 7: 321, 9–14) and Marius Victorinus: "*artium grammaticarum scriptores quidam ab arte coeperunt, quidam a grammatica, quidam a definitione, quidam a uoce, quidam a littera*" (1, 1 M). The commentators of Donatus (here Servius) sometimes defend the way Donatus began his grammatical works: "*plerique artem scribentes a litterarum tractatu inchoauerunt, plerique a voce, plerique a definitione artis grammaticae. sed omnes videntur errasse. non enim propriam rem officii sui tractauerunt, sed communem et cum oratoribus et cum philosophis. nam de litteris tractare et orator potest; de voce nemo magis quam philosophi tractant; definitio etiam Aristotelicorum est. unde proprie Donatus et doctius, qui ab octo partibus inchoauit, quae specialiter ad grammaticos pertinent*" (GL 4: 405, 4–11). Servius is writing on the *Ars minor*, which begins with a list of the eight parts of speech (the *Ars maior* begins with a brief description on *uox*).

² I, 3–4: "*Ars est unius cuiusque rei scientia usu uel traditione [perditionem] percepta. Ars ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς dicta est; unde et ueteres artem etiam pro uirtute usurpauerunt.*"

³ Presumably Schad attributes the definition transmitted in the *Explanationes* to the second century AD grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus.

⁴ "In fact, Scaurus began with this: 'art is the knowledge of each subject acquired by practice or tradition' ...".

grammar echoes the definition appearing in the *APS*: “*ars est rei cuiusque scientia usu vel traditione vel ratione percepta tendens ad usum aliquem vitae necessarium*” (*GL 1*: 421, 4–5).⁵ Diomedes may have combined material from two or more sources, as seems to have been his *modus operandi*. Other definitions of *ars* that bear a partial resemblance to the definition in the *APS* can be found in the grammars of Ps.-Probus, Victorinus, Audax, and book 2 of the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus.⁶ However, because of a number of differences, I would hesitate to posit a direct link between the definition of *ars* preserved in the *APS* and the definitions preserved in the four texts mentioned above.⁷ In the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius, the source for the definition of *ars* is named. As Ps.-Sergius refers to the *APS* consistently as Scaurus, we can safely assume his source was the *APS*.⁸ The case of Diomedes is more complicated: he often combines more than one source, without necessarily naming any of them.⁹ Looking at the definition of *ars* occurring in his work, it is possible that the first part of his definition (*ars est rei cuiusque scientia usu vel traditione vel ratione percepta*) shares the same origin as the definition appearing in the *APS*. In his discussion of Diomedes’ grammar, Raphael Dammer (2001: 187) perceives in his definition of *ars* echoes of the same tradition that appears also in the grammar of Audax and the *Explanationes*; this tradition he ascribes ultimately to (Q. Terentius) Scaurus. However, as Ps.-Sergius’ attribution of this material has come under suspicion, we are left in doubt as to the ultimate origin of this definition of *ars*.

I have decided to exclude the word *perditionem* appearing on line 3 from the definition, following Vivien Law’s emendation (1987: 71). A part of the definition of *ars* appearing in the grammar of Diomedes, “...usu vel traditione vel ratione percepta” (*GL 1*: 421, 4), offers a possible

⁵ “*Ars* is the knowledge of each subject acquired by practice, tradition or doctrine, which aims to some usefulness necessary to mankind.”

⁶ See *GL 4*: 47, 16; *GL 6*: 187, 2; *GL 7*, 320, 5 and 91, 12 respectively. In these definitions it is mostly the very beginning, “*ars est (unius) cuiusque rei scientia*”, which coincides with the definition appearing in the *APS*. Also, two commentaries on Donatus’ works, those of Pompey (*GL 5*: 95, 5) and Servius (*GL 4*: 405, 2), preserve this shorter definition of *ars*.

⁷ Some of the writers who quote these definitions of *ars* say something on their origin. See, e.g., Cassiodorus: “*quam disertis viri uniuscuiusque rei scientiam vocant*” (91, 13) and Servius: “*quam Graeci unius cuiusque rei scientiam vocant*” (*GL 4*: 405, 2–3). These writers do not seem to know the exact origin for the definition of *ars* they include in their texts. The earliest extant instance of this kind of definition of *ars* is most likely in the early fourth-century *Instituta Artium*: “*Ars est unius cuiusque rei scientia summa subtilitate adprehensa*” (*GL 4*: 47, 16).

⁸ Although, the version Ps.-Sergius was using was, perhaps, slightly different from that preserved in Clm 6281. This would account for the difference between the two definitions (*suscepta/percepta*), which cannot easily be attributed to a scribal mistake.

⁹ See p. 38 in chapter 1.4. Cf. also the discussion on Diomedes’ definition of the pronoun in Carraro (1999: 85): “L’*Ars* di Diomede non è una raccolta antologica come quella di Carisio, ma un’opera in cui l’autore mette in risalto il proprio intervento, non solo nella costruzione e sistemazione della teoria, ma anche e soprattutto nell’utilizzo delle fonti. ... Il grammatico però non è sempre riuscito a controllare in modo chiaro la materia: spesso giustapponendo e legando parti simili di opere diverse, ha creato confusione, se non vere e proprie incongruenze. Anche nella definizione di pronomi sembra di poter trovare una conferma di questo metodo di lavoro: *Pronomen est pars orationis quae pro ipso nomine posita minus quidem, paene idem tamen significat personamque interdum recipit*. ... Come si può constatare, essa si compone di due parti: la prima è pressoché uguale a quella di Carisio, la seconda è un’aggiunta che si trova per la prima volta in Donato”.

explanation for the curious manuscript reading (*perditionem*), that is, as a corrupt form of *vel ratione*. However, Diomedes' well-known tendency to edit his sources (see p. 38 above) and the relatively close agreement of the text of the *APS* (I, 3) with that of the *Explanations* (GL 4: 486, 9–11) at this point speak for the exclusion of *perditionem*.

Late Antique Latin grammarians offer two different etymologies for the term *ars*, one Latin¹⁰ and one Greek. In the *APS* only the Greek etymology, “ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς” (I, 3–4), appears. This etymology is also preserved in the grammars of Diomedes, Ps.-Probus, and Audax, in the works of some of the commentators of Donatus, as well as the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus.¹¹ In his account of the grammar of Diomedes, Dammer characterizes this etymology as “Gemeingut der Fachtradition”, as it appears in numerous grammars, grammatical commentaries, and in Isidore's *Etymologiae* (1.2) (2001: 188).

The author of the *APS* then proceeds to discuss *ars grammatica*, a subtype of the more general concept, *ars*. The tasks of *ars grammatica* are briefly described: “*Ars grammatica praecipue consistit <in> intellectu poetarum et in recte scribendi loquendique ratione*” (I, 5–6).¹² This echoes the traditional definition of *ars grammatica*, which can already be found in Quintilian: “*Haec igitur professio, cum brevissime in duas partis dividatur, recte loquendi scientiam et poetarum enarrationem, ...*” (*Inst.* 1.4.2).¹³ This bipartite division of *ars grammatica* into the interpretation of the poets and the art of correct speaking found in the *Institutio oratoria* emerges later also in a slightly different form: grammar is divided into two parts, *exegetice* and *horistice*. This division is found in the more detailed discussions on *ars* in Diomedes' and Marius Victorinus' works.¹⁴ The *APS* does not include this division, nor does it make any reference to the tasks of grammar according to Varro, which are repeated in several other Late Antique grammars.¹⁵

¹⁰ The Latin etymology connects *ars* with the adjective *artus* ('narrow'). See, for example, Servius: “*vel certe ideo ars dicitur, quod artis praeceptis cuncta concludat, id est angustis et brevibus*” (GL 4: 405, 3–4). The *Explanations* of Ps.-Sergius includes only the Latin etymology (“*ars autem dicta est eo, quod artius ad peritiam urgeat pertendentes*”, GL 4: 486, 14–15), even though also the Greek one was most likely available to him in one of his sources, the *APS* (barring some omission in that particular manuscript or version of the *APS*).

¹¹ See Diomedes: “*vel ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, unde veteres artem pro virtute appellabant*” (GL 1: 421, 8–9), Ps.-Probus: “*nam et Graeci ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, a virtute, censebant artem esse dicendam. unde et veteres artem pro virtute frequenter usurpant*” (GL 4: 47, 17–18), Audax: “*hanc Graeci, quod industriae virtute bona possideret, areten dixerunt*” (GL 7: 320, 7–8), and Cassiodorus: “*alii dicunt a Graecis hoc tractum esse vocabulum, apo tes aretes, id est a virtute*” (91, 13). Of the commentators of Donatus, for instance, Pompey preserves this etymology: “*quaeritur enim etymologia ipsius artis. multi dicunt artem dictam esse ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς*” (GL 5: 95, 5–7), as does Servius: “*Ars dicta est vel ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, id est a virtute*” (GL 4: 405, 2).

¹² “Above all, grammar consists in the interpretation of the poets and the knowledge of correct speech and writing.”

¹³ “Although (to put it in a word) this subject comprises two parts – the study of correct speech and the interpretation of the poets—” (translated by Russell 2001: 103). Cf. also Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.9.1).

¹⁴ Diomedes (GL 1: 426, 15–18) and Marius Victorinus (1, 5M).

¹⁵ “*Grammaticae officia, ut adserit Varro, constant in partibus quattuor, lectione enarratione emendatione iudicio.*” (Fragment 236 in Funaioli (1907) and fr. 109 in Goetz-Schoell (1910)). See also Dositheus (1, 6–7Bo), Victorinus (GL

Luhtala (2010: 214) points out that Donatus does not define *ars* or *ars grammatica* in either of his grammars, nor does he discuss its tasks. The explanation offered for the absence of these definitions has usually been that by the time Donatus wrote his grammars, they were taken for granted and needed no further explication (2010: 214). Luhtala suggests, however, that the absence of such a definition might be a conscious decision on the part of Donatus, whose grammars were much narrower in scope than, for instance, the more philologically oriented grammar of Diomedes (2010: 215).¹⁶ Diomedes, who discusses *ars grammatica* at length (*GL* 1: 426, 12–427, 2), wrote a grammar more in line with what was traditionally seen as the scope of grammar, discussing also its methodological principles, correct usage (*latinitas*), metrics, and poetic genres in addition to the technical part of grammar.¹⁷ That the *APS* contains brief descriptions of *ars* and *ars grammatica*, despite the fact that it is almost exclusively concerned with the technical part and not particularly concerned with the study of literature,¹⁸ can, perhaps, betray the reluctance to abandon completely the traditional understanding of *ars grammatica* and its scope. The notion of grammar as an ancillary to the study of literature was deep-rooted. However, the fact that these discussions are reduced to the bare minimum in the *APS*¹⁹ (certainly compared with Diomedes' and Marius Victorinus' works, but also with shorter grammars such as that of Victorinus)²⁰ speaks for a shift of emphasis toward the technical part of grammar in the *APS*.

The closest parallel to the description of the scope of *ars grammatica* in the *APS* is the passage preserved in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius, which depends on the *APS*.²¹ The text of the *Explanationes* as well as the manuscript M preserve the reading *loquendiue* ('or speaking') instead of *loquendique* ('and speaking'). I have emended the manuscript reading to *loquendique*, as all the

6: 188, 7–8), and Audax (*GL* 7: 322, 4–5). These four tasks, all pertaining to the study of literature, not the study of language, resemble the authentic part of the *Techne grammatike* of Dionysius Thrax, where grammar is defined as “an experience [*empeiria*] for the most part of what is said in poets and prose-writers”. Its “parts” (sometimes called “duties” or “tasks”) prescribe how the grammarian is to approach and teach any text – just what we should expect from the pupil of Aristarchus. They comprise: “practiced reading respecting prosody; explication of the poetic tropes present [sc. in the text]; prompt elucidation of unusual words and histories [i.e. allusions to persons and places, etc., from myth and history]; discovery of etymology; calculation of analogy; and, the finest of everything in the expertise, judgment of poems” (Atherton & Blank 2013: 297).

¹⁶ A definition of *ars* or *ars grammatica* (or rather *techne/t. grammatike*) has also not been preserved in any of the extant works of Apollonius Dyscolus. No later grammarian attributes such definitions to him either.

¹⁷ The first book in Diomedes' grammar contains the discussion on the parts of speech, books 2 and 3 are reserved for the treatment of the methodological principles, correct usage, stylistics, composition (book 2), metrics, and literary genres (book 3) (See the discussion in Luhtala 2010: 218–220).

¹⁸ Nothing on *uitia et uirtutes orationis* or on metrics, for instance, is preserved in the extant version of the *APS*.

¹⁹ The discussion on *ars* and *ars grammatica* in the *APS* spans only five lines.

²⁰ Victorinus' discussion on *ars* and *ars grammatica* takes up 28 lines of text (*GL* 6: 187, 2–188, 12).

²¹ *GL* 1: 486, 15–16: “*ars grammatica praecipue consistit in intellectu poetarum et in recte scribendi loquendive ratione.*”

other instances with a similar content have the variant *-que* not *-ue*.²² Such a mistake would be very easy to make in the course of the transmission of the text. Also, the addition of the preposition *in* on line I, 5, correcting a haplography that had taken place at some stage of the transmission, is corroborated by the corresponding passage in the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 486, 15–16).²³

Other passages close to the one preserved in the *APS* can be found in the works of Diomedes, Marius Victorinus, Victorinus, and Audax. Diomedes includes four different definitions and divisions of *ars grammatica* in his discussion, one of which partially coincides with the description in the *APS*: “*tota autem grammatica consistit praecipue intellectu poetarum et scriptorum et historiarum prompta expositione et in recte loquendi scribendique ratione*” (GL 1: 426, 18–20).²⁴ The difference between the passages in Diomedes and the *APS* could be simply due to using a slightly different source, or Diomedes may have once again reworked a definition in his source by including additional material from another, similar passage. Marius Victorinus, who includes altogether six definitions or divisions of *ars grammatica/grammaticae* in his chapter on *ars*, quotes one that comes close to the description appearing in the *APS*.²⁵ Unlike Diomedes, he is content with *intellectu poetarum*, without referring to prose writers, but a few lines later he adds yet another definition, which supplies the information missing from the previous description.²⁶

The final element in the chapter entitled *de arte* is the etymological definition of *ars grammatica*, or *grammaticae*, as it is termed at this point.²⁷ The etymology found in the *APS*, ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων, is only preserved in two other grammars²⁸ in addition to the *Explanationes*, which directly depends on the *APS*. Neither Marius Victorinus or Diomedes, who discuss this concept at length, provides a similar etymological definition for *grammatica/grammaticae*. The form

²² See, for instance, Victorinus: “... et recte scribendi loquendique ratio” (GL 6: 188, 2) (similarly also in Audax, GL 7: 321, 7), Diomedes: “et in recte loquendi scribendique ratione” (GL 1: 426, 20), and Marius Victorinus: “et recte loquendi scribendique ratione” (1, 5M).

²³ However, note the similar passage in Diomedes’ grammar (GL 1: 426, 18–20): “tota autem grammatica consistit praecipue intellectu poetarum et scriptorum et historiarum prompta expositione et in recte loquendi scribendique ratione.” Mariotti’s opinion concerning the passage in Diomedes (1976: 126 n. 3) supports my addition of the preposition *in* to the text of the *APS*: “A me sembra naturale integrare consistit praecipue <in> intellectu poetarum: la frase è bilanciata su due membri (in intellectu et expositione da una parte, in ratione dall’altra), e l’inconcinnitas sarebbe dura. L’ablativo semplice con consisto è d’altra parte eccezionale, facile qui la caduta di in (...).”

²⁴ “The art of grammar as a whole consists especially of the fluent exposition of the poets and prose-writers and the knowledge of correct speech and writing.”

²⁵ 1, 5M: “Haec [sc. grammatica] quot modis discernitur? Tribus. Quibus? Intellectu poetarum et recte loquendi scribendique ratione.”

²⁶ Namely a definition of *ars grammatica* attributed to Varro: “ut Varroni placet, ‘Ars grammatica, quae a nobis litteratura dicitur, scientia est <rerum> quae a poetis, historicis oratoribusque dicuntur ex parte maiore.’” (1, 6M). This definition echoes that appearing in the authentic part of the grammar attributed to Dionysius Thrax (cf. p. 72 n. 15 above)

²⁷ I, 6: “Grammaticae ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων dicta est.”

²⁸ Victorinus (GL 6: 188, 2–3): “dicta autem ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων, [id est ab his litteris]” and Audax: “ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων, id est a litteris, cui nomen latinum a quibusdam litteratura vel litteralitas datum est” (GL 7: 321, 7–9).

grammaticae is less common in Late Latin grammars than the Latin form *grammatica*; it is, however, attested in the grammars of Priscian, Diomedes, Marius Victorinus, and Victorinus, for instance. The *Explanationes* has not preserved the reading *grammaticae*; it seems to have been normalized to *grammatica* by the compiler or at some stage of the transmission of the text.

Lastly, a correlation is drawn with the way Greeks derived the term *grammaticae* from the word meaning ‘letters’ (τά γράμματα) and Romans, according to the author, looked to the word *litterae* for similar terminology (*litteratura/litterator*).²⁹ The *Explanationes* repeats this passage almost word for word (*GL* 4: 487, 1–2); the only divergence is the use of the term *Latini* where the *APS* has *Romani*. Also Diomedes refers to the same phenomenon in a slightly different context, not in his discussion on *grammatica*, but in the chapter on *ars*, where he distinguishes *ars grammatica* from other types of *artes*.³⁰ Other references to *grammatica* as *litteratura* can be found in the works of Marius Victorinus, Ps.-Asper, and Audax, where Varro’s doctrine on the matter can be found.³¹

In addition to the references to Varro³² using *litteratura* for *grammatica*, we can find the term *grammaticae* glossed with *litteratura* twice in Quintilian’s work.³³ However, the term *litteratura* was common in neither Classical nor Silver Latin,³⁴ and, when it became so, it was used in the sense of ‘literature’ in the writings of the Christian fathers, for instance (Bower 1961: 474). Besides the instances of *litteratura* in Late Latin grammars that were mentioned above, *litteratura* as ‘grammar’ appears infrequently also in other Late Antique writings, but in this sense it is often glossed with *grammatica* or otherwise clarified (Bower 1961: 474–475).³⁵ The term *litterator* is also equated in the *APS* (and the *Explanationes*) and Diomedes’ work with *grammaticus*. Unlike *litteratura* (in the sense of ‘grammar’), *litterator* is well established. The question whether *litterator* should be equated here with a teacher of *grammatica* or a philologist is not completely clear. Schad (2007: s.v. *litterator*) gives two separate meanings for the term *litterator*: ‘a teacher’ (e.g., in Suetonius and

²⁹ I, 6–7: “unde et Romani a litteris appellauerunt litteraturam, item grammaticum litteratorem.”

³⁰ Diomedes (*GL* 1: 421, 9–13): “artium genera sunt plura, quarum grammaticae sola litteralis est, ex qua rhetorice et poetice consistunt; idcirco litteralis dicta, quod a litteris incipiat. nam et grammaticus Latine litterator est appellatus et grammatica litteratura, quae formam loquendi ad certam rationem dirigit.” For discussion on this passage in Diomedes, see the commentary on the grammar of Marius Victorinus by Mariotti (1967: 121).

³¹ See Marius Victorinus: “ut Varroni placet, ‘Ars grammatica, quae a nobis litteratura dicitur, ...’” (I, 6M) and a corrupt passage in Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 547, 7–10): “grammatica est scientia recte scribendi et enunciandi interpretandique poetas per historiam *formatam ad usum rationemque verborum, quam Terentius [et] Varro primum ut adhuc rudem appellatam esse dicit litteraturam.” For Audax see p. 74 n. 28 above.

³² Some scholars do not consider the evidence convincing enough to support the argument that Varro proposed the use of *litteratura* for *grammaticae*. See, for instance, Bower (1961: 475).

³³ *Inst.* 2.1.4: “et grammaticae, quam in Latinum transferentes litteraturam vocaverunt, fines suos norit” and *Inst.* 2.14.3: “Nos ipsam nunc volumus significare substantiam, ut grammaticae litteratura est”.

³⁴ To Cicero *litteratura* means ‘writing’ (*Part.* 7. 26), see also Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.13.2). Apuleius uses *prima litteratura* when he is talking of basic or primary education (*Pl.* 1.2).

³⁵ See, for example, Augustine (*de Ord.* 2.12.37) and (*de Mus.* 2.1.1).

Gellius)³⁶ and ‘a scholar of language’ (quoting the passages in Diomedes and the *Explanationes*). According to Booth (1981: 377–378), the standard sense of *litterator* from the first century BC on was ‘teaching *grammaticus*’, as opposed being an equivalent to *ludi magister* (‘a teacher of reading and writing’). He feels, however, that *litterator* “always connotes the teaching of boys, while *litteratus* designates a man of letters” (1981: 378). However, what is at issue in the passages in the *APS* and the *Explanationes* is not necessarily whether *litterator* and *grammaticus* are completely equivalent terms, but rather the fact that in both Greek and Latin a similar process was used to create the terminology relevant to the subject.

³⁶ Suetonius (*Gram.* 4.1 ff.) and Gellius (18.9.2ff.).

3.2 De uoce

The second chapter in the *APS* contains a discussion on *uox*.¹ The passage begins with a definition of *uox*: “*Vox est aer ictus sensibilis auditu, uerbis emissa et exacta sensus prolatio.*”² This definition is found only in the *APS* and the *Explanationes*,³ which depends on the *APS*. The first part of the definition, “*Vox est aer ictus sensibilis auditu*”, appears also in many other Late Antique definitions of *uox*, usually coupled with the phrase “*quantum in ipso est*”.⁴

The fact that most extant Latin definitions of *uox* couple these two phrases together raises questions about the definition preserved in the *APS*, which does not. Obviously, we cannot rule out some kind of an omission in the manuscript tradition.⁵ There are, however, instances in the Greek and Latin tradition of definitions of *uox* (or *φωνή*) that do not include the latter part, “*quantum in ipso est*” (or its Greek counterpart). Among Late Latin grammarians, Audax defines *uox* with just “*Vox quid est? aër ictus auditu sensibilis*” (*GL* 7: 323, 5). In his discussion on the definition of *uox*, Schenkeveld (1990b: 302 n. 30) points out a definition of *φωνή* quoted by Ps.-Plutarch,⁶ which also lacks the latter part. Priscian, who most likely used Greek sources directly, as was his usual method, defines *uox* thus (*GL* 2: 5, 1–2): “*philosophi definiunt, vocem esse aerem tenuissimum ictum vel suum sensibile aurium, id est quod proprie auribus accidit.*” Priscian’s definition echoes the Stoic philosophers’ definitions of sound, some of which are preserved in Diogenes Laertius’ *Vitae philosophorum*.⁷

¹ The term *uox* can be translated in a number of ways: ‘sound’, ‘voice’, ‘utterance’, ‘word’. For more discussion on *uox*, see Schad (2007: s.v. *vox*).

² II, 3: “Sound is air that is struck which is perceptible to the ear and the pronouncing of an idea expressed with words.”

³ *GL* 4: 487, 3–4: “*vox est aer ictus sensibilis auditu, uerbis emissa et exacta sensus prolatio.*”

⁴ See, e.g., Donatus, *Ars maior* (603, 2H): “*Vox est aer ictus sensibilis auditu, quantum in ipso est.*” See also Dositheus (6, 2–3Bo), Victorinus (*GL* 6: 189, 9), Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta Artium* (*GL* 4: 47, 3–4), Marius Victorinus (2, 1M), and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 420, 9–10). The problematic phrase, *quantum in ipso est*, has been interpreted in several different ways. The fourth-century *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus glosses “*quantum in ipso est*” with “*hoc est quam diu resonat*” (*GL* 4: 47, 3–4). But according to Mariotti (1967:125), this is not the correct explanation: “Com’è chiaro dal greco, dove *ἐαυτῷ* non può riferirsi ad *ἀκοή*, *in ipso* significa ‘in aere icto’;”. Copeland & Sluiter (2009: 87 n. 30) present two interpretations for this phrase: “‘In and by itself’: *quantum in ipso est*. ... (1) ‘in as far as it depends on the air that has been struck,’ that is, independent of the question whether the sound is actually perceived. This disambiguates the phrase ‘perceptible to the ear’. Thus Stroh, ‘*De vocis definitione quadam Stoica*’. (2) ‘in and by itself,’ ‘in isolation,’ ‘an und für sich’: thus Ax, *Laut, Stimme und Sprache ...*; Schenkeveld, ‘The Stoic *techne peri phônês*: Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics III.’”

⁵ Although if this is the case, the omission would have taken place at a relatively early stage, as the fifth to sixth century *Explanationes* has the same reading as the *APS*.

⁶ *De musica* 1131D: “ἐπεὶ δὲ ὀρίζονται τὴν φωνὴν οἱ ἄριστοι γραμματικοὶ ἀέρα πεπληγμένον αἰσθητὸν ἀκοῇ”.

⁷ Cf. Priscian’s definition to “*φωνή ἐστιν ἀήρ πεπληγμένος*” (*Vit. phil.* 7.55) and a definition attributed to Diogenes of Babylon “*ἡ τὸ ἰδίων αἰσθητὸν ἀκοῆς*” (7.55). Ax (1986: 175) attributes to Diogenes the replacing of “*τὸ αἰσθητὸν ἀκοῆς ὅσον ἐφ’ ἐαυτῷ*” in what he sees as the original Stoic definition, “*ἔστι δὲ φωνή ἀήρ πεπληγμένος ἡ τὸ αἰσθητὸν ἀκοῆς ὅσον ἐφ’ ἐαυτῷ*”, with “*τὸ ἰδίων αἰσθητὸν ἀκοῆς*”, taken over from Aristotle’s *de Anima* (II, 6, 418 a 7ff.), making the

The second part of the definition of *uox* occurring in the *APS*, “*uerbis emissa et exacta sensus prolatio*”, is unusual for a definition of sound in that such definitions generally do not mention meaning (*sensus*). The reference to meaning is all the more confusing, as the examples for *uox inarticulata* a few lines down include examples such as the neighing of horses (*equi hinnitus*). Few definitions of sound in Late Latin grammars make any reference to meaning. An exception to this rule is Diomedes’ definition of *eloquium* (‘speech’), a subtype of *uox*: “*eloquium est humanae pronuntiationis expressa significatio facilem mentibus efficiens intellectum*” (*GL* 1: 420, 19–20).⁸ Also some definitions of *uox articulata* are of interest here: particularly those occurring in Priscian’s and Diomedes’ works, “*articulata est, quae coartata, hoc est copulata cum aliquo sensu mentis eius, qui loquitur, profertur*” (*GL* 2: 5, 6–7)⁹ and “*articulata est rationalis hominum loquellis explanata*” (*GL* 1: 420, 12–13).¹⁰ The pairing of the traditional definition of sound as a physical phenomenon of struck air (*aer ictus*) and an utterance of an idea through words in the *APS* seems somewhat inconsistent. Perhaps there has been some omission during the transmission of the text, or the author has ill-advisedly equated two definitions that were meant to define two different things (for example *uox* and *uox articulata*). The mention of meaning could also, perhaps, point to the definition having been based on a definition of *oratio* (λόγος), not *uox* (or φωνή).¹¹

The manuscript reading for the latter part of the definition is *uerbis emissa sensus et exacta prolatio*. A similar reading can be found in the manuscript on which Keil based his edition of the *Explanationes*. He emended that reading to *uerbis emissa et exacta sensus prolatio*, which I have also accepted in my edition of the *APS*.

After the definition of *uox* the author of the *APS* divides *uox* into two types: *articulata* and *inarticulata*.¹² The bipartite division is the prevailing one in Late Latin grammars, with the exception of Priscian, who has a unique division consisting of two pairs of opposites.¹³ In most

definition more understandable, while still keeping to the same idea. See Schenkeveld (1990b: 301) for a fuller discussion on this topic.

⁸ Diomedes has included two different divisions of *uox* in his grammar: the usual division into two types of sound (*articulata* and *confusa*) and another one, much rarer, into three types of sound (*eloquium*, *tinnitus*, and *sonus*).

⁹ “‘Articulate’ sound is compressed, that is to say it is expressed in combination with a mental meaning of the speaker” (translated by Copeland & Sluiter, 2009: 172).

¹⁰ “Articulate (sound) is rational (sound) by humans expressed with words.”

¹¹ Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* (7.55): “ζῶον μὲν ἐστὶ φωνὴ ἄηρ ὑπὸ ὀρμῆς πεπληγμένος, ἀνθρώπων δ’ ἔστιν ἐναρθρός καὶ ἀπὸ διανοίας ἐκπεπομένη, ὥς ὁ Διογένης φησὶν, ἥτις ἀπὸ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν τελειοῦται” and (7.56): “λόγος δὲ ἐστὶ φωνὴ σημαντικὴ ἀπὸ διανοίας ἐκπεπομένη, οἷον Ἡμέρα ἐστί.”

¹² II, 3–6: “*Haec aut articulata est aut inarticulata. Inarticulata est quae auditur et non percipitur, ut infantis uagitus, equi hinnitus, mugitus bouis. Articulata est quae auditur et percipitur et est interpretabilis, ex qua constant litterae.*”

¹³ Priscian divides *uox* into *uox articulata/uox inarticulata* (+/- intelligible) and *uox literata/uox illiterata* (+/- can be written down). Priscian’s two divisions result in four types of *uox* (*GL* 2: 5, 9–6, 2): “... quae possunt scribi et intellegi, ut: «arma virumque cano», quaedam, quae non possunt scribi, intelleguntur tamen, ut sibili hominum et gemitus: ... aliae autem sunt, quae, quamvis scribantur, tamen inarticulae dicuntur, cum nihil significant, ut coax, cra. aliae vero

grammars containing a division of *uox*, the usual designations for the two types of sound are *articulata* and *confusa*.¹⁴ In addition to the diverging terminology, also the criteria for dividing sound into two types in the *APS* are different than in many Late Latin grammars. Donatus' *Ars maior*, for instance, contains the following division (603, 2–4H): “*Omnis vox aut articulata est aut confusa. articulata est quae litteris comprehendi potest, confusa quae scribi non potest.*”¹⁵ Whether sounds can be written down is for Donatus what distinguishes *uox articulata* (‘articulate sound’) from *uox confusa* (‘confused sound’).¹⁶ He is not alone in using this as the only criterion, as it appears also in the works of Dositheus (6, 3–5Bo) and Cledonius (*GL* 5: 26, 31–32). Many grammarians accept this criterion, but also add additional ones, like Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 47, 5–6): “*articulata est, qua homines locuntur et litteris comprehendi potest.*”¹⁷

In the *APS*, whether sounds can be written down is not a criterion in distinguishing between *uox articulata* and *uox inarticulata* (‘inarticulate sound’). The author considers intelligibility the key element in distinguishing between these two types of sound.¹⁸ Similar criteria for distinguishing between the two types of sound can also be found also in other discussions of *uox*, in Diomedes’ and Marius Victorinus’ grammars, for instance.¹⁹

The term *articulata* is frequent in Late Latin grammars, unlike the term *inarticulata*. In addition to the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 487, 4–8), which depends on the *APS* for its content here, *inarticulata* can only be found in Priscian’s and Dositheus’ grammars. In Priscian’s four-part division of *uox*, however, the term has a slightly different meaning (cf n. 13 above).²⁰ The

sunt inarticulatae et illitteratae, quae nec scribi possunt nec intellegi, ut crepitus, mugitus et similia.” See also the discussion in Schenkeveld (1990b: 304–306).

¹⁴ See Donatus (603, 2–4H), Dositheus (6, 3–5Bo), Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 47, 4–8), Victorinus (*GL* 6: 189, 10–14), Audax (*GL* 7: 323, 5–9), Marius Victorinus (2, 2M & 2, 4M), and the *Explanationes in artem Donati* (*GL* 4: 519, 14–18).

¹⁵ “Every sound is either articulate or confused. Articulate sound can be captured in letters, confused sound cannot be written”, translated by Copeland & Sluiter (2009: 87).

¹⁶ This criterion is found already in Varro’s works. See Varro’s opinion appearing in Augustine’s *De dial.* V: “... *articulatam dico quae comprehendi litteris potest.*”

¹⁷ “Articulate sound is the speech of humans and it can also be captured in letters.” See also Victorinus (*GL* 6: 189, 10–14) and Audax (*GL* 7: 323, 5–9).

¹⁸ See II, 4–5: “*Inarticulata est quae ... non percipitur*” and “*Articulata est quae ... percipitur et est interpretabilis*”. The author of the *APS* also adds “*quae auditur*” to the definitions of both types of sound. This seems somewhat superfluous, because the definition of sound (*uox*) at the beginning of the chapter already contained this information (*sensibilis auditu*). A similar mention can, however, be found also in the *ars* of Marius Victorinus (2, 2M): “*articulata est quae audita intellegitur et scribitur et ideo a plerisque explanata, a non nullis intellegibilis dicitur.*”

¹⁹ Diomedes adds the criterion of (ir)rationality for distinguishing between the two types of sound (*GL* 1: 420, 10–15): “*omnis vox aut articulata est aut confusa. articulata est rationalis hominum loquellis explanata. eadem et litteralis vel scriptilis appellatur, quia litteris comprehendi potest. confusa est irrationalis vel inscriptilis, simplici vocis sono animalium effecta, quae scribi non potest, ut est equi hinnitus, tauri mugitus.*” For Marius Victorinus’ view, see 2, 2M.

²⁰ In Priscian’s *Institutiones* human groaning (*gemitus*), for instance, comes under *uox articulata* (but it is also *illitterata* as it cannot be written down), unlike in the *APS*, where a similar kind of sound, namely crying (*uagitus*), is mentioned under *uox inarticulata* as something that cannot be understood. Cf. Priscian, *GL* 2: 5, 9–14: “*inveniuntur igitur quaedam voces articulatae, quae possunt scribi et intellegi, ut: «arma virumque cano», quaedam, quae non possunt*

term *inarticulata* and its Greek variant (*ἄναρθρος*) can be found in Dositheus' bilingual grammar.²¹ The term *ἄναρθρος* can also be found in the scholia of Dionysius Thrax, but these instances are considered to be relatively late.²² In the passage in Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae philosophorum* referred to above (7.55–56), only the terms (*φωνή*) *ἔναρθρος* (comparable to *uox articulata*) and (*φωνή*) *ἐγγράμματος* (echoed in Priscian's *uox literata*) can be found, but no terms referring to the opposite circumstances occur.²³ In extant Greek grammars no passages comparable to the chapter *de uoce* exist.²⁴ Thus the exact origin of the competing terms in Latin grammar, *uox confusa* and *uox inarticulata*, remains unclear.

The author of the *APS* discusses the two types of sound in the following order: *uox inarticulata*, *uox articulata* (cf. II, 4–5). This diverges from the order used in almost all extant discussions on the subject.²⁵ Even in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius, which mostly depends on the *APS* for its discussion of *uox*, the order has been transposed to coincide with the normal one, *articulata*, *inarticulata*.²⁶ The odd inversion occurring in the *APS* can, perhaps, be due to the source the author was using, or it may be explained by what follows next in the chapter on *uox*. The author of the *APS* states that it is the *uox articulata* that forms the basis for letters: “*ex qua constant litterae*” (II, 5–6). Next, the author proceeds to discuss the constituents of *oratio*, beginning with “*Litteris praeposenda uox est ...*” (II, 7).²⁷ Perhaps the author of the *APS* sought to make the transition smoother by transposing the discussion on the two types of sound and moving directly from the discussion on *uox articulata*, where *litterae* are mentioned, to a discussion on the constituents of language, where they are once again discussed.

As mentioned above, the author of the *APS* then discusses the constituents of *oratio* (‘sentence’, ‘utterance’).²⁸ In the first part (II, 7–8), the author argues for the precedence of sound

scribi, intelleguntur tamen, ut sibili hominum et gemitus: hae enim voces, quamuis sensum aliquem significant proferentis eas, scribi tamen non possunt.”

²¹ The term *inarticulata* occurs in one of the manuscripts containing Dositheus' grammar, the *codex Harleianus* (H). The most recent editor, Bonnet, prefers the reading (*confusa*) of the *codex Sangallensis*, S (6, 3–5Bo), as does Tolkiehn (11, 3–4T). The edition by Keil (*GL* 7: 376–436) is based on only the manuscripts S and M (*codex Monacensis*).

²² Cf. *GG* 1/1, 130, 9ff.; 181, 19ff.; 478, 12ff.

²³ Cf. Schenkeveld (1990b: 305) (a resumé of Ax, 1986: 150). The term *ἐγγράμματος* does, however, occur in Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae philosophorum*, but it appears in his discussion on Plato (3.107). I would like to thank Dr. Jaana Vaahtera for pointing out this passage to me.

²⁴ See Schenkeveld (1990b: 298).

²⁵ Only the grammar of Cleodnius lists the two types of sound in a similar order (*GL* 5: 26, 30–32): “*Articulatae: quia duo genera sunt vocum, confusa pecorum, quae scribi non potest, articulata hominum, quae legi et scribi potest.*”

²⁶ *GL* 4: 487, 4–8: “*vox enim aut articulata est aut inarticulata. articulata est quae auditur et percipitur et est interpretabilis intellectum habens vel faciens litteram [articulata vox litteris comprehendendi potest]. inarticulata est quae audiri potest, intellegi non potest, ut vagitus infantis, balatus ovis, hinnitus equi, mugitus bovis.*”

²⁷ “Sound should precede letters...”

²⁸ II, 7–10: “*Litteris praeposenda uox est ideo, quia non littera elementum tribuit uoci, sed uox litteris, quae utique hominis est etiam sine litteris. Ita enim uoce constant litterae, litteris syllabae, syllabis exprimitur uel brevis dictio uel numerosa, quae multiplicem compleat orationem.*”

over letters, and, in the second part (II, 8–10), he lists the constituents (*uox*, *litterae*, *syllabae*, *dictiones*, *oratio*). Similar passages can be found also in other Late Latin grammars, for example, in the works of Diomedes, Dositheus, Audax, Priscian, and Ps.-Sergius.²⁹

That sound (*uox*) should be take precedence over letters (*litterae*) seems clear from the very order of the chapters in the *APS* (*de arte*, *de uoce*, *de litteris* ...). The *APS* justifies the precedence of sound over letters by stating that people do not need letters to produce sound (II, 8),³⁰ which is inherent in human beings, unlike letters. Victorinus and Audax seem to support the idea of sound being natural to human beings in their discussion on the best way to begin a grammar.³¹ Also Pompey agrees, thinking that letters are formed on the basis of sound.³² However, the idea presented at II, 7–8³³ is contradicted in the next chapter (*de litteris*), where the following definition of the *littera* occurs: “*Littera est elementum uocis articulatae*” (III, 3).³⁴ Still, as there is no trace of corruption or confusion in this passage, I do not offer any emendation to lines 7–8 regardless of the contradiction with the doctrine of the next chapter. The two contradicting passages may come from two different sources, and the failure to update or reconcile contradicting sources is certainly not unheard of in Late Latin grammars.

The last section in this chapter lists the constituents of *oratio*. No corresponding passage is literally the same as the one in the *APS*, but the one appearing in the *Explanationes* is partly the same (see n. 29). The same elements (*uox*, *littera*, *syllaba*, *dictio*, *oratio*) are listed in the *Explanationes*, and the same doctrine as regards the concepts of *uox* and *littera* can be found in that passage.³⁵ Audax first lists the same constituents as the *APS*, but then continues to include also the

²⁹ This passage in the *Explanationes* does not depend only on the *APS*: cf. “*vox enim facit litteram, litterae faciunt syllabam, syllabae faciunt partes orationis*” (GL 4: 487, 2–3) and “*syllabis enim exprimitur brevis dictio vel numerosa, quae multiplicem complet orationem*” (GL 4: 487, 14–15). See II, 8–10 in the previous note. In addition to material from the *APS*, the introductory chapter in the *Explanationes* contains also passages from other sources and shows traces of modifying the material originating in the *APS*. Later in the text, lengthy passages from the *APS* (cf. the chapter on the conjunction and the preposition) are routinely taken over by the compiler with minimal editing, but in the preface more changes have been made to the material.

³⁰ It is not completely clear in this passage (II, 7ff.) whether *uox* refers to sound in general or to ‘articulate sound’ (*uox articulata*). Articulate sound, belonging to human beings, would make more sense in this context (cf. Victorinus, GL 6: 189, 10: “*articulata quae est? hominum tantum modo*”). On the ambiguous use of *uox* in Latin grammar, see Ax (1986: 45ff.).

³¹ The fact that sound is natural to humans prompts Victorinus to speak against beginning a grammar with a discussion on *uox* (GL 6: 188, 3–6): “*unde incipere debet? quidam [etiam] a voce coeperunt alii a litteris, alii a syllabis, alii a casibus, nos autem a definitione. qui tamen coeperunt melius? utique qui a definitione vel a litteris. nam vox naturalis est et sine grammatica communis etiam cum imperitis.*” See also Audax (GL 7: 321, 9–14).

³² Pompey (GL 5: 96, 6–8): “*multi et a voce inchoant ea ratione, quoniam litterae, de voce sunt natae, et non possumus pervenire ad secundam, nisi dixerimus primam partem.*”

³³ Also the discussion at II, 5–6 is in conflict with the definition of *littera*. II, 5–6: “*Articulata ... ex qua constant litterae.*”

³⁴ “The letter is the smallest particle of articulate sound.”

³⁵ Compare “*vox enim facit litteram ...*” (GL 4: 487, 2) with “*ita enim uoce constant litterae ...*” (II, 8).

uitia et uirtutes orationis.³⁶ Priscian (*GL* 3: 108, 9–10), following Apollonius Dyscolus, lists *litterae*, *syllabae*, *dictiones*, and *oratio*. Diomedes and Dositheus begin with *elementa* (‘speech sounds’) followed by *litterae*, *syllabae*, *dictiones*, *partes orationis*, *oratio*, and finally the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*.³⁷

The phrase “*syllabis exprimitur uel brevis dictio uel numerosa*”³⁸ (II, 9) warrants some comment. The adjective *numerosus* is not, strictly speaking, the antonym of *brevis* (‘short’); rather we should regard *dictio numerosa* as a word consisting of many parts, like *classis numerosa* (Iuv. *sat.* 7.151) is a fleet consisting of many ships. The many parts could in this context refer to letters or syllables forming a word,³⁹ not full words forming a compound word (like *sub* and *urbanus* forming *suburbanus* at IX, 87).

³⁶ *GL* 7: 321, 16–322, 3: “<vox> igitur, ut diximus, litteris nititur, litterae syllabis clauduntur, syllabae in dictionem conveniunt, dictio orationem auget, oratio partibus divisa in virtutes vitiaque descendit. vitia reprehenduntur soloecismo, barbarismo et his quas Graeci κακίας λόγων appellant. virtutes vero digeruntur in tropos, schemata, metaplasmos et his similia.”

³⁷ Diomedes, *GL* 1: 426, 32–427, 2: “Grammaticae initia ab elementis surgunt, elementa figurantur in litteras, litterae in syllabas coguntur, syllabis comprehenditur dictio, dictiones coguntur in partes orationis, partibus orationis consummantur oratio, oratione virtus ornatur, virtus ad evitanda vitia exercetur.” See also Dositheus (1, 15–19Bo).

³⁸ “Both short and lengthy words are composed of syllables...”

³⁹ I would like to thank Dr. Jaana Vaahtera for pointing out to me that Priscian includes *numerus* (the number of letters in a syllable) as one of the *accidentia* of the syllable, cf. *GL* 2: 53, 4–6: “*numerus literarum accidit syllabae, quia, ut supra diximus, non minus quam unius nec plus quam sex literarum apud Latinos potest inueniri syllaba.*”

3.3 De litteris

The chapter discussing *littera* opens with its definition.¹ This is followed immediately by the definition of *elementum*.² In the *APS*, the following definitions of *littera* and *elementum* occur: “*Littera est elementum uocis articulatae*.³ *Elementum est unius cuiusque rei initium, a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resolvitur*” (III, 3–4).⁴ The same two definitions appear coupled together also in a few other Late Latin grammars: for instance, in Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta artium* (GL 4: 48, 33–34) and Dositheus’ grammar (7, 2–4Bo) in addition to the *Explanationes*⁵ (GL 4: 487, 10–11; 15–16).

As mentioned already in chapter 3.2, the definition of *littera* appearing here is in contrast with the doctrine occurring in the chapter on *uox*. In the previous chapter *uox articulata* is not defined as sound that can be captured in letters, as it was defined by, for instance, Donatus. What distinguishes *uox articulata* from *uox inarticulata* in the *APS* is rather that *uox articulata* is intelligible, whereas *uox inarticulata* is not. The definition used in the *APS* for *littera* would make more sense if the definition of *uox articulata* focused on whether articulate sound was writable or not. In the two other grammars where these same definitions of *littera* and *elementum* occur – that is, the works of Ps.-Probus and Dositheus, we indeed find *uox articulata* defined as sound that can be captured in letters.⁶ This coincidence and the fact that the definition of *littera* contradicts the doctrine in the

¹ The term *littera* covers both the speech sound and its graphic form (Merello 1981: 101). Some Latin grammarians, such as Diomedes (GL 1:421, 20ff.) and Priscian (GL 2: 6, 24ff.), adopt the term *elementum* when speaking of the speech sound, not the graphic sign, for which they reserve the term *littera* (Schad 2007: s.v. *elementum* 2).

² In the *APS*, the term *elementum* does not signify ‘speech sound’, but rather ‘element’ or ‘primary particle’ in general (see Schad 2007: s.v. *elementum* 1). Other grammarians, such as Diomedes and Priscian, use the term *elementum* for ‘speech sound’ (see also the previous note), e.g., Diomedes (“*elementum est minima vis et indivisibilis materia vocis articulatae*”, GL 1: 421, 17–18) or Priscian (“*littera est nota elementi*”, GL 2: 6, 23). On the use of the corresponding terms *elementum*/στοιχείον, see the discussion toward the end in Schad (2007: s.v. *elementum*).

³ “The letter is the smallest particle of articulate sound.” For a discussion on other definitions of *littera*, from the earliest extant sources (Q. Terentius Scaurus apud Diomedes, Velius Longus, etc.), see Merello (1981: *passim*).

⁴ “A particle is the origin of each thing, from which it can be increased and into which it can be separated.”

⁵ The text of the *Explanationes* shows some confusion in this section (GL 4: 487, 10–16: “*littera enim elementum vocis articulatae [a quo initium sumitur incrementum], ut Terentianus metra docens ait elementa, rudes quae pueros docent magistri. syllabis enim exprimitur brevis dictio vel numerosa, quae multiplicem complet orationem. elementum ergo est unius cuiusque rei initium, a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod solvitur*.” The definition of *littera* is followed by a part of the definition of *elementum* (rejected by Keil). This is followed by a literary quotation concerning *elementum*, not *littera*. Next, comes a misplaced sentence (*syllabis ... orationem*), which probably belongs to the passage at GL 4: 487, 2–3. The definition of *elementum* is then quoted again, this time in full. In the preface to the second book of the *Explanationes*, the definition of *elementum* is quoted again, but this time only in part. At this point the definition is attributed to Scaurus, unlike in the preface to the first book: “*initium autem aliqua pars incipiens a multis modis. unde Scaurus initium, a quo sumitur incrementum*” (GL 4: 535, 6–7).

⁶ Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 47, 5–6): “*articulata est, qua homines locuntur et litteris comprehendere potest*”. Dositheus (6, 4Bo): “*Articulata est quae litteris comprehendere potest*.”

chapter on *uox*⁷ lead me to think that the source for the chapter on *littera* and that on *uox* in the *APS* cannot be the same.

After the definition, the author of the *APS* moves on to the properties (*accidentia*) of *littera*: “*Accidunt uni cuique litterae nomen, potestas, figura. Nomen est quo enuntiatur, potestas qua ualet, figura qua notatur*” (III, 4–5).⁸ These three properties are the ones that appear most often in Late Antique Latin grammars: for example, in Donatus’, Dositheus’, Diomedes’, and Ps.-Probus’ works. Some grammarians add also *ordo* to the properties of *littera*.⁹ Three similar properties for the term γράμμα (‘letter’) are mentioned by Diogenes Laertius in his *Vitae philosophorum* in the section on the Stoic philosophers.¹⁰

The name of the letter (*nomen*) is most often defined as ‘that by which it is called’ (*quo appellatur*);¹¹ in the *APS* we find, however, the wording “*quo enuntiatur*” (‘that by which it is made known’). Also Ps.-Asper¹² and Diomedes use the same verb in their discussions: “*nomen est quo dicitur vel enuntiatur*” (Diomedes, *GL 1*: 421, 28–29)¹³.

For the other properties the author of the *APS* offers the standard definitions found in most grammarians discussing this issue: “*potestas qua ualet, figura qua notatur*” (III, 5)¹⁴. The order in which the properties are listed in the *APS* (*nomen, potestas, figura*) diverges from that appearing in

⁷ Cf. the definition of *littera* (III, 3) with “*Litteris praeponenda uox est ideo, quia non littera elementum tribuit uoci, sed uox litteris, quae utique hominis est etiam sine litteris. Ita enim uoce constant litterae*” (II, 7–8) in the chapter on *uox*.

⁸ “Each letter has the following properties: a name, a force, and a form. The name of the letter is that by which it is called, the force reveals the sound value of a letter, and the form is used when writing it down.”

⁹ See Ps.-Asper (*GL 5*: 548, 2) and Priscian (*GL 2*: 9, 3). Concerning the *accidens ordo*, cf. the term τάξις in the scholia of Dionysius Thrax (e.g., *GG 1/3*, 31, 19; *GG 1/3*, 326, 7ff.). See Schad (2007: s.v. *littera 1*).

¹⁰ *Vit. phil.* 7.56: “*τριχῶς δὲ λέγεται τὸ γράμμα, τὸ τε στοιχεῖον ὃ τε χαρακτήρ τοῦ στοιχείου καὶ τὸ ὄνομα, οἷον Ἀλφά*”. See also Sextus Empiricus (*adv. math.* 1.99ff.) for the three characteristics of στοιχεῖον (“*καὶ δὴ τριχῶς λεγόμενον τοῦ στοιχείου, τοῦ τε γραφομένου χαρακτήρος καὶ τύπον καὶ τῆς τοῦτον δυνάμεως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος*”). This terminology is echoed in the works of Latin grammarians of the second century AD, such as Velius Longus and Q. Terentius Scaurus, who use *potestas* (=δύναμις) signifying ‘sound value’ in *GL 7*: 47, 18 and *GL 7*: 12, 14, for example. See Schad (2007: s.v. *potestas 5*). For more discussion on the *accidentia* of *littera*, see Mariotti (1967: 137–138).

¹¹ Cf. Charisius, Dositheus, Marius Victorinus, and Ps.-Probus.

¹² Ps.-Asper: “... *nomine quo enunciatur*” (*GL 5*: 548, 3). The verb *enuntio* has also a more specifically grammatical meaning ‘to pronounce’, cf., for example, Quintilian (1.7.28; 1.5.18) and Q. Terentius Scaurus (17, 16Bi; 31, 14Bi). That sense is not, however, applicable here.

¹³ Diomedes has once again combined several sources and offers a double definition for each property (*GL 1*: 421, 28–31): “*accidunt unicuique littera tria, nomen figura potestas. nomen est quo dicitur vel enuntiatur; figura, cum scripta aspiciunt vel notatur; potestas qua ualet in ratione metrica, id est cum ad proprietatem suam a reliquis segregatur*.”

¹⁴ The definition “*potestas qua ualet*” is further explained by some grammarians, like Ps.-Probus (*GL 4*: 49, 2): “*potestas litterae est qua ualet, hoc est qua sonat*.” See also the quotation from Diomedes in the previous note. Only Priscian and Donatus offer definitions without the verb *valere*: “*potestas ... ipsa pronuntiatio, propter quam et figurae et nomina facta sunt*” (Priscian, *GL 2*: 9, 2ff.) and “*quaeritur enim, quid uocetur littera, qua figura sit, quid possit*” (605, 8–9H). The definition “*figura qua notatur*” is the prevalent one among Late Latin grammarians. Some grammarians feel the need to add another explanation, as Diomedes (see the previous note) and Cledonius do (*GL 5*: 28, 19–20): “*figura, qua notatur, hoc est imago ipsius, qua fingitur*”. Other definitions for *figura* are, e.g., “... *qua scribitur*” (Ps.-Asper, *GL 5*: 548, 3) and “*figuram oculis deprehendimus*” (Audax, *GL 7*: 325, 13).

all other discussions of the subject (*nomen, figura, potestas*).¹⁵ However, as the order is the same in both the preliminary list (III, 4–5) and the following definitions (III, 5) and no other sign of confusion can be detected in the text at this point, I see no reason to change the order to match that of the other Latin grammars discussing the subject.¹⁶

One emendation has been made to the passage on the *accidentia* of littera. I have emended the manuscript reading *quod* to *quo* (III, 5) on the basis of the similar passages in Diomedes (*GL* 1: 421, 29) and Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 548, 3).

Next, after a primary division of letters into vowels and consonants,¹⁷ the author of the *APS* discusses vowels (III, 6–9). He first defines vowels and then enumerates them. Two of the vowels, namely *i* and *u*, merit a further mention, as they, or rather their graphic forms, can sometimes represent consonants.¹⁸ The definition of the vowel in the *APS* coincides with the definition quoted in most discussions of the subject in Late Antique Latin grammars: “*Vocales sunt quae per se proferuntur et per se syllabam faciunt*.”¹⁹ Indeed, the author of the *APS* seems to be following some widely circulated source in his discussion on *litterae*, as the whole passage (III, 6–9) can also be found in several other grammars, with only negligible differences in the wording.²⁰

The author of the *APS* then moves on to discuss consonants (III, 10–17). Consonants are divided into two types: *semivocales* and *mutae*. This division of consonants appears in Latin

¹⁵ Cf. Schad (2007: s.v. *littera*).

¹⁶ There is not much variation in the order the *accidentia* of *littera* are presented in the Latin grammars, but this is not the case in the Greek sources. Cf. n. 10 above and the Greek variants listed by Mariotti in his discussion (1967: 137ff.).

¹⁷ The division into vowels and consonants and the division of consonants further into semivowels and mutes is mentioned already in Plato (*Cratylus* 424c, *Philebus* 18b). In his *Poetics* (1456b), Aristotle uses the term for semivowels that is in use also in later writings (e.g., in Ps.-Dionysius Thrax), namely ἡμίφωνα. There are relatively early instances of the term *semiuocalis* in Latin sources as well, for instance, in Caesar’s writings: “*cum omnes artis latores, praecipueque Caesar, propter rationem metricam et structurarum qualitates singularum litterarum sonos ponderarent, hac ratione semivocales mutis praeferendas iudicaverunt, quos semivocales geminatae ad sonum vocalibus occurrunt, hoc est ut syllabam facere possint, ut puta fla ars mons iners et cetera talia; at vero mutae geminatae, si vocalibus occurrant, nec syllabam nec sonum scilicet facere possint. quis enim b c d k p q t g geminatas vocalibus misceat et sonum syllabae potest audire?*” (Ps.-Probus, *GL* 4: 50, 21–28 = Funaioli 1907: 151, fr. 13). See also Varro: “*Varro dicit consonantes ab e debere incipere, quae semivocales sunt, et in e debere desinere, quae mutae sunt*” (Ps.-Sergius, *GL* 4: 520, 18–20 = Funaioli 1907: 269, fr. 241). See also Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.4.6): “*... non quia magnae sit operae consonantes a vocalibus discernere ipsasque eas in semivocalium numerum mutarumque partiri...*”. For the term *semiuocalis*, see n. 21 below.

¹⁸ Cf. Quintilian’s discussion on the subject (*Inst.* 1.4.10–11), which begins with “*Atque etiam in ipsis vocalibus grammatici est videre an aliquas pro consonantibus usus acceperit, quia ‘iam’ sicut ‘etiam’ scribitur et ‘quos’ ut ‘tuos’*.”

¹⁹ III, 6–7: “Vowels can be pronounced alone and form a syllable by themselves.” Among Late Latin grammarians only Marius Victorinus and Diomedes offer diverging definitions. Marius Victorinus adds the following to the more prevalent definition (3, 14M): “*Vocales sunt quae plenam vocem proferunt, per quas etiam separatas syllabas fieri volunt*.” Diomedes augments the standard definition thus (*GL* 1: 422, 5–7): “*vocalium potestates sunt duae, quod tam pronuntiatae singulae syllabas faciunt et per se proferuntur quam cum consonantibus iunctae syllabam facere possunt*.” See also Priscian’s definition (*GL* 2: 9, 5–7): “*ex his vocales dicuntur, quae per se voces perficiunt vel sine quibus vox literalis proferri non potest, unde et nomen hoc praecipue sibi defendunt*”.

²⁰ Cf. Dositheus (7, 6–13Bo) and Marius Victorinus (3, 6–7M). Also Donatus’ (603, 6–604, 2H) account is very close.

grammatical sources already in Varro and Caesar (see n. 17).

The semivowels are discussed first (III, 11–14).²¹ Like that of the vowel, the definition of the semivowel in the *APS* matches the definitions appearing in many of the discussions on the subject:²² “*Semiuocales sunt quae per se quidem proferuntur, sed per se syllabam facere non possunt*” (III, 11).²³ The semivowel *x* is said to consist of two letters, *gs* or *cs*, and thus some reject it altogether (III, 12–14). Varro and Quintilian both report such views, in addition to numerous Late Antique Latin grammarians and commentators.²⁴

Mute consonants (*mutae*)²⁵ are discussed on lines 14–17. Also the definition of mute consonants in the *APS* coincides with the most prevalent definition in Late Latin grammars.²⁶ After listing the nine letters considered mute consonants, the author of the *APS* moves on to discuss the ‘superfluous’ letters, namely *k*, *q*, and *h* (III, 15–17). According to Varro, none of these should be

²¹ Semivowels (*semiuocales*) correspond here broadly to spirants and liquids (including nasals). Nowadays mostly the speech sounds represented by *w* and *y* (in English) are considered semivowels. The term *semiuocalis* can be found in a grammatical context first in Caesar and Varro’s writings (see n. 17 above).

²² For instance, those appearing in the grammars of Dositheus (7, 15–17Bo), Charisius (5, 7–11B), Donatus (604, 10–11H), and Marius Victorinus (3, 8M). Marius Victorinus offers also another definition for semivowels (3, 17M): “*Semivocales sunt quae partem quandam vocis incipiunt, sed implere non possunt*”. Diomedes and Ps.-Probus augment the aforementioned definition with additional material. Cf. Diomedes (GL 1: 423, 6–8): “*semivocales dictae, quod dimidium eius potestatis habent. etenim per se enuntiantur, sed per se nec syllabam nec plenam vocem faciunt*” and Ps.-Probus, who seeks to further explain this definition (GL 4: 49, 27–34): “*hae [sc. semivocales] secundum musicam rationem per se proferuntur, hoc est ut ad vocabula sua nullius vocalium egeant societate, ut f l m n r s x. at vero secundum metra Latina et structurarum rationem subiectae vocalibus nomina sua efficiunt, ut ef el em en er es ex. sed per se syllabam facere non possunt, scilicet quoniam semivocales litterae, si inter se misceantur, sonum syllabae facere non reperiuntur, ut puta fl ms rx ns; et ideo, ut diximus, per se semivocales syllabam facere non possunt.*” See also Priscian’s etymological definition (GL 2: 9, 18–21): “*semiuocales autem sunt appellatae, quae plenam uocem non habent, ut semideos et semiuiros appellamus, non qui dimidiam partem habent deorum uel uirorum, sed qui pleni dii uel uiri non sunt.*”

²³ “Semivowels can be pronounced by themselves, but they cannot form a syllable alone.”

²⁴ Varro’s views on the letter *x* are preserved in Cassiodorus’ *De orthographia* (which incorporates material from Annaeus Cornutus’ *De enuntiatione*): “*in libro qui est de grammatica Varro, cum de litteris dissereret, [ita] h inter litteras non esse disputauit, quod multo minus mirum, quam quod x quoque litteram esse negat, in quo quid uoluerit, nondum deprehendi, ipsius uerba subiciam: litterarum partim sunt et dicuntur, ut a et b; partim dicuntur neque sunt, ut h et x; quaedam neque sunt neque dicuntur, ut φ et ψ*” (GL 7: 153, 1–6 = Funaioli 1907: 206, fr. 49). See also Quintilian on the superfluity of the letter *x* (1.4.9): “*an rursus aliae (litterae) redundant, ... et nostrarum ultima, qua tam carere potuimus quam psi non quaerimus.*” Most grammars (the *APS* included) argue that the letter *x* is, in fact, formed from two distinct letters, *gs* or *cs*: “*id est gs aut cs, ut rex et regs, pix et pics*” (Ps.-Probus, GL 4: 49, 36–37), but some grammarians bring up examples that contradict this idea: “*at in hoc nomine non est simile huic tractatui, quod est nix nivis*” (Ps.-Probus, GL 4: 50, 2–3). See also Diomedes (GL 1: 426, 3–6) or the *Catholica* of Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 31, 29–34).

²⁵ *Mutae* correspond to roughly plosives (with the addition of *h*, which is now considered an aspirate). The Greek term for mutes is (*ἀφωνα*); it appears already in Plato’s writings.

²⁶ III, 14–15: “*Mutae sunt quae nec per se proferri possunt, nec per se syllabam facere.*” Cf. Charisius (5, 22–24B), Dositheus (7, 20–21Bo), Donatus (604, 10H), and Marius Victorinus (3, 9M). Also Diomedes quotes this definition, but he adds another one immediately before it (GL 1: 423, 8–10): “*mutae sunt quae sine auxilio vocalium non possunt enuntiiari. mutae sunt quae nec proferri...*”. Ps.-Probus seeks to explain the usual definition by including additional material (GL 4: 50, 5–10): “*Mutae consonantium litterae sunt numero novem. hae nec per se proferuntur nec per se syllabam facere possunt. per se hae non proferuntur, siquidem vocalibus litteris subiectis sic nomina sua definiunt, ut puta be ce de ge ha ka pe qu te. per se autem syllabam facere non possunt, scilicet quoniam mutae litterae, si misceantur, sonum syllabae facere non reperiuntur, ut puta bc dg tk pq et cetera talia.*”

considered letters; Quintilian thinks the letter *h* should be considered a symbol for aspiration, but he leaves open the question whether the letters *k* and *q* should be considered redundant.²⁷ The *APS* takes no fixed position as regards *k* and *q*,²⁸ and some Late Latin grammarians, such as Donatus and Ps.-Probus, defend the inclusion of *k* and *q* among the letters.²⁹ As regards the letter *h*, the author of the *APS* is clear: he considers the letter *h* a graphic sign to mark aspiration.³⁰ Charisius, Dositheus, and Marius Victorinus share this view.³¹ However, Donatus and Diomedes, among others, argue that it is both a letter and a graphic sign to mark aspiration.³² Finally, Victorinus, for instance, considers *h* a letter in its own right.³³ The last part of this section on mute consonants consists of a brief mention of the Greek origin of the letters *y* and *z*. The author of the *APS*, along with Donatus and Marius Victorinus, offers no examples for the use of these letters, unlike some of the authors of longer discussions on *littera*.³⁴

Two emendations of note have been made to the passage on lines 10–17. On line 11, I changed the manuscript reading *et* to *sed*, which is corroborated by the text of other similar passages in, for instance, the works of Donatus, Dositheus, and Marius Victorinus.³⁵ The passage describing the letter *x* also showed some confusion, and thus the manuscript reading “*aut ex s et g litteris ex g*” has been emended to “*aut ex g et s litteris <aut> ex c <et s>*”. This reading is more in line with the content of other similar passages on the subject. Lastly, I added the missing mute consonant, *h*, on line 15 to complete the list of nine consonants.

The text of the *APS* from line 3 to line 17 coincides almost entirely with the beginning of the

²⁷ Varro’s views have been preserved in Priscian’s *Institutiones* (GL 2: 13, 8–10): “*auctoritas quoque tam Varronis quam Macri teste Censorino nec k nec q nec h in numero adhibet litterarum.*” Priscian continues that *k* and *q* should be considered different (graphic) forms of the same sound, *c* (GL 2: 13, 13–16): “*sicut enim, quamvis in varia figura et vario nomine sint k et q et c, tamen, quia unam vim habent tam in metro quam in sono, pro una litera accipi debent.*” For Quintilian, see *Inst.* 1.4.9.

²⁸ Cf. “... *superuacuae quibusdam uidentur esse ...*” (III, 15).

²⁹ Donatus (604, 16–605, 2H): “*ex his supervacuae quibusdam videntur k et q; qui nesciunt, quotiens a sequitur. k litteram praeponendam esse, non c; quotiens u sequitur, per q, non per c scribendum*” and Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 50, 10–15): “*nunc et in his mutis supervacuae quibusdam k et q litterae positae esse videntur, quod dicant c litteram earundem locum posse complere, ut puta Carthago pro Karthago. nunc hoc vitium etsi ferendum puto, attamen pro quam quis est qui sustineat cuam? et ideo non recte hae litterae quibusdam supervacuae constitutae esse videntur.*”

³⁰ III, 16–17: “*H quoque adspirationis notam, non litteram, existimamus.*”

³¹ Dositheus (7, 24–25Bo), Charisius (5, 29B), and Marius Victorinus (3, 10M).

³² Donatus (605, 2–3H): “*h interdum consonans interdum adspirationis creditur nota.*” See Diomedes (GL 1: 423, 15–16) and Servius (GL 4: 422, 34–35). See also the view presented by Cledonius: “*h: quotiens iuvat vocalem, consonans est; quotiens non iuvat, nota adspirationis est*” (GL 5: 28, 8–9).

³³ Victorinus (GL 6: 196, 1–2): “*quid de h respondebimus? adspirationis nota, non littera existimatur, verum tamen littera est.*” See also Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 50, 15–18): “*item ex isdem mutis h aspirationis notam, non litteram esse existimaverunt, cum et haec, sic uti ceterae, certum sonum retineat potestatis suae, ut puta honos: numquidnam onos? aut cetera talia; et ideo hoc quoque non recte existimasse notandi sunt.*”

³⁴ For instance, Victorinus (GL 6: 196, 3–7): “*quae sunt litterae peregrinae? y et z. quare peregrinae? siquidem a nobis propter Graeca nomina adsumptae sunt, ut puta Hylas, zephyrus. quae si <adsumptae> non essent, Hulas et sdepherus diceremus. y inter quas apud nos habetur? inter uocales. z inter quas? inter mutas, et est duplex.*”

³⁵ Donatus (604, 10H), Dositheus (7, 15–17Bo), and Marius Victorinus (3, 8M).

passage on *littera* in Dositheus' grammar (7, 1–26Bo). There are scarcely any divergences of note between the two passages. There is also a significant resemblance between lines 6–17 of the *APS* and sections 3, 6–3, 10 in the chapter on *litterae* in Marius Victorinus' *ars*. Both Dositheus and Marius Victorinus go on to add more material in their discussions on *litterae*, whereas the author of the *APS* is content with this briefer treatment.³⁶

According to the author of the *APS*, the number of letters capable of appearing in the final position of nouns in the nominative singular³⁷ is 13. There is no universal agreement among Late Latin grammarians on this number, with some arguing for 12 and some for 13 and even as many as 15.³⁸ After giving the number of possible final letters, the author proceeds to list the specific letters as well as examples for all the possible types. Examples similar to those appearing in the *APS* can be found in Victorinus' and Audax's grammars.³⁹ The list in Donatus' *Ars maior* also comes close, except for the substitution of *monile* ('necklace') for *sedile* ('seat').⁴⁰

Of all the similar discussions on the final letter in Latin nouns, only a few appear in the chapter on *litterae*.⁴¹ Donatus, for instance, includes this discussion at the very end of his chapter on the noun.⁴² Diomedes discusses the issue under the heading *de casibus*, along with diverse paradigms, information on the declensions, and the like. Two of the discussions on the final letters can be found in a grammatical compilation, the *Excerpta Andecavensia* (on lines 64–68 and 336–341), where no specific context exists. Finally, the treatise *De nomine* attributed to Probus begins with a discussion on the final letters for all six cases.⁴³ This *regulae*-type work then moves on to

³⁶ The rest of the chapter *de litteris* in these two grammars (Dositheus' and Marius Victorinus' *artes*) does not coincide.

³⁷ Although that we are discussing nominative singular forms is not stated, like in some other treatments of this issue, for instance, Donatus' *Ars maior* (628, 10–13H), Diomedes' grammar (*GL* 1: 303, 3–7), and the *Catholica* of Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 32, 7–9).

³⁸ Charisius, Donatus, Diomedes, and a passage in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* give the number of final letters as twelve, although all but Charisius then mention the nouns ending in *c*, such as *lac*: "*sunt qui addunt c, ut lac*" (Diomedes, *GL* 1: 303, 6). The fifteen letters found in the discussion in the *Catholica* of Ps.-Probus are explained by the fact that the author seems to consider the long and short *e* and *o* to be separate letters (like in the Greek alphabet): "*nominativus singularis fit modis quindecim, a, e utraque, i, o utraque, u l m n r s x c t, poeta monile Danae gummi Varro Dido genu mel bonum carmen orator sacerdos verax lac caput*" (*GL* 4: 32, 7–9).

³⁹ Audax (*GL* 7: 327, 11–13) = Victorinus (*GL* 6: 196, 15–17): "*Quae ergo sunt? A e i o u l m n r s x c t. harum exempla, tabula monile frugi ratio genu mel scamnum flumen arbor flos nox allec caput.*"

⁴⁰ As mentioned above, Donatus does not include the letter *c* in his list proper, but adds the information at the end of his discussion (628, 13H), where he includes the same example, *allec* ('fish-sauce'), which also occurs in the *APS*: "*Adiciunt quidam c, ut allec, lac*".

⁴¹ Victorinus and Audax include this information in the chapter on letters. Also Marius Victorinus includes a discussion on the possible endings of nouns in the nominative in his chapter on *littera* (3, 28–29M), but he lists the endings by gender – seven final letters for masculines, six for feminines, and seven for neuters (cf. also Ps.-Dionysius Thrax's account in the chapter on *στοιχεῖον*).

⁴² Following Donatus, also his commentator Pompey includes this discussion towards the end of the discussion on the noun, at *GL* 5: 199, 5–19.

⁴³ Ps.-Probus (61, 2–12P): "*nominativus finitur litteris tredecim: uocalibus quinque, id est a e i o u, ut Sisenna monile sinapi Cicero ueru, semiuocalibus sex, id est l m n r s x, consul scamnum flumen Caesar Liuius silex, mutis duabus, id est t et c, ut caput lac; genetivus tribus, id est s i e, ut Catonis magistri Musae; dativus tribus, id est i o e, ut agili docto*

discuss the correct case forms or gender in various nouns and adjectives.

Lastly, the author adds a reference to Varro regarding rules on the connections (*cognatio*) between letters (or rather speech sounds).⁴⁴ These connections between different letters with respect to their phonetic characteristics are also discussed by Quintilian in his *Institutio oratoria*, for instance (1.4.12; 1.4.16).⁴⁵ Later, in the second century AD, Q. Terentius Scaurus includes a whole section explaining the connections between sounds in his treatise entitled *De orthographia*.⁴⁶ In the second century AD, the term *cognatio* is also attested in Gellius (13.9.5). Varro, to whom the author of the *APS* refers, uses the term *cognatio* with regard to the derivation of words.⁴⁷ It cannot be ruled out that he used the term *cognatio* also in conjunction with relationships between letters in the lost books of the *De lingua Latina* or another lost work of a linguistic orientation.⁴⁸ However, no such usage is preserved in the fragments of Varro known to us.⁴⁹ Nor do we have any way of knowing for certain whether the author of the *APS* had firsthand access to Varro's writings or whether, and this is more plausible for a Late Antique grammarian, he was referring indirectly to Varro's doctrine as preserved in some later work. Among the Late Latin grammarians, Marius Victorinus and Priscian, for instance, mention such connections between speech sounds (*cognatio*, *cognatae inter se vocales*, *ex cognatis*, and the like).⁵⁰

scholae; accusatiuus quattuor, id est m s t e, ut hominem fumus caput monile; uocatiuus septem, a e i m r x o, ut Musa monile Liui scammum Caesar silex Cato, sed in generibus neutris similis est nominatiuo; ablatiuus terminatur uocalibus quinq[ue], ut ab hac schola ab hoc monile ab hoc agili ab hoc docto ab hoc ueru, item m s et r, ut nequam nugas instar."

⁴⁴ III, 21–22: "Ceterum de cognatione litterarum quae multiformis <est> satis abundeque Varronis praecepta seruamus."

⁴⁵ 1.4.16: "Quid T litterae cum D quaedam cognatio? Quare minus mirum si in vetustis operibus urbis nostrae et celebribus templis legantur 'Alexanter' et 'Cassantra'..."

⁴⁶ The passage in *De orthographia* begins with (11, 8–12Bi): "redditis ergo uitiorum modis, et emendationis regula exposita, antequam ad ea ueniamus, circa quae scribentium error argui solet, necessarium putamus ante cognationem explicare litterarum, quoniam huius quoque notitia haesitantibus saepe succurrat."

⁴⁷ L. 5.13: "Sed qua cognatio eius eris verbi quae radices egerit extra fines suas, persequemur." See also Schad (2007: s.v. *cognatio*).

⁴⁸ These works include, for instance, *De antiquitate litterarum ad Accium libri II* (cf. Priscian, *GL* 2: 7, 27), written in c. 90, or *Peri charakteron libri III* (cf. Charisius, 246, 3B).

⁴⁹ Possibly Varro's contemporary Cicero spoke on the connections between letters (or speech sounds): "Item consonantes inter se [cognatae vocantur], sed proprie sunt cognatae, quae simili figuratione oris dicuntur, ut est b f [s] m p, quibus Cicero adicit v, non eam quae accipitur pro vocali, sed eam quae consonantis obtinet vicem et anteposita vocali fit ut aliae quoque consonantes" (Marius Victorinus 4, 64M = Funaioli 1907: 419, fr. 2). Although from this passage it is hard to know what kind of terminology Cicero was using.

⁵⁰ For *cognatio* in Priscian, see, for instance, *GL* 2: 24, 3; 19, 16; 33, 1; 11, 11, and 43, 1. For *cognatio* in Marius Victorinus, see 4, 64M; 4, 67M, etc.

3.4 De syllabis

The chapter on syllables (*syllabae*) in the *APS* opens with the definition: “*Syllaba est littera uocalis uel litterarum copulatio una comprehensa iunctura.*”¹ This definition is unique to the *APS*, but it exhibits partial similarities to other definitions of *syllaba* in Late Latin grammars. Definitions of *syllaba* in a few other grammars also begin with the phrase “*syllaba est littera uocalis*”.² Such definitions occur in the works of Charisius, Dositheus, and Victorinus, for instance.³ These definitions also contain the phrase *litterarum coitus* (‘a coalescence of letters’), which closely resembles the expression *litterarum copulatio* occurring in the definition of *syllaba* in the *APS*.⁴

Many Late Antique Latin grammars, however, describe syllables consisting of only one vowel as inaccurately so called. These passages often also contain a reference to the Greek etymology for the term *syllaba*, which several grammarians report as “τὸ συλλαμβάνειν τὰ γράμματα”.⁵ Even without reporting the Greek etymology, some grammarians still condemn the labelling of syllables consisting of only one vowel as syllables, as also the Latin definitions of *syllaba* contain expressions such as *coitus*, *coniunctio*, *copulatio*, *conexio*, and so on, all of which refer to the combining of letters (or rather speech sounds) to form syllables. On many occasions, the use of the term *syllaba* of a single vowel is criticized as inaccurate (e.g., “*abusive dicitur*”).⁶

The chapter on the syllable in the *APS* does not include a Greek etymology for the term *syllaba*, nor does the author anywhere condemn the labelling of a single vowel as a syllable. In this it resembles the chapter on the syllable in Dositheus’ grammar and the *Ars maior* of Donatus.

¹ IV, 3: “A syllable is either a vowel or a combination of letters bound into a single unit.”

² “A syllable is a vowel”.

³ Charisius (8, 9–14B): “*Syllaba est littera uocalis uel litterarum coitus per aliquam vocalem comprehensus. syllabae dicuntur a Graecis παρὰ τὸ συλλαμβάνειν τὰ γράμματα, Latine conexiones uel conceptiones, quod litteras concipiunt atque conectunt; uel comprehensio, hoc est litterarum iuncta enuntiatio*”, Dositheus (11, 2–4Bo): “*Syllaba est littera uocalis uel litterarum coetus per aliquam uocalem comprehensus, hoc est litterarum iuncta enuntiatio*”, and Victorinus (GL 6: 196, 19–20): “*Syllaba quid est? Littera uocalis uel litterarum coitus per aliquam vocalem comprehensus*” = Audax (GL 7: 327, 15–16).

⁴ Although not, strictly speaking, synonyms, both *copulatio* and *coitus* are used to describe letters (or speech sounds) that are joined to form syllables and syllables that are joined to form words. See Schad (2007: s.v. *coitus*, *copulatio*).

⁵ That is, ‘the combining of letters’. Cf., e.g., Charisius (see n. 3 above), Diomedes (GL 1: 427, 7–8), Fortunatianus (GL 6: 279, 24–25): “*syllaba enim a Graecis dicitur ἀπὸ τοῦ συλλαμβάνειν τὰ στοιχεῖα*”, Cleodnius (GL 5: 28, 23–24):

“*Syllaba dicta est ἀπὸ τοῦ συλλαβεῖν, eo quod plures litterae comprehensae una, a pluribus litteris dicta*”. See also Servius (GL 4: 423, 11–12) and Aphthonius (GL 6: 35, 2).

⁶ Cf. Marius Victorinus (5, 1M): “*Syllaba est coniunctio litterarum cum vocali uel vocalibus sub uno accentu et spiritu continuata: nam per solam vocalem abusive syllaba dicitur.*” See also, e.g., Priscian (GL 2: 44, 2–3): “... abusive tamen etiam singularum vocalium sonos syllabas nominamus” and Charisius (9, 9–11B): “*dicitur autem per catachresin syllaba et is sonus qui de singulis vocalibus redditur, ut a e.*” This view is expressed also by several commentators of Donatus, such as Pompey (GL 5: 111, 27–30), Cleodnius (GL 5: 28, 24–26), and Servius (GL 4: 423, 13–14). Cf. also the definition of the syllable in the grammar of Ps.-Dionysius Thrax (GG 1/1, 16, 7ff.).

For the latter part of the definition appearing in the *APS*, “*uel litterarum copulatio una comprehensa iunctura*”, some parallels can also be found in other Late Latin grammars. The term *copulatio* (‘combination’), occurs in the definition of the syllable in the grammar of Diomedes, for instance.⁷ The term is also in use in the grammars of Priscian and Marius Victorinus,⁸ as well as the metrical treatise of Aphthonius, which has the most instances of the term *copulatio* among Late Latin grammarians, according to the *CGL* database. He uses the term to describe the joining together of letters or, more often, metrical feet or verses.⁹

Another term appearing in this latter part of the definition of *syllaba* is *iunctura* (‘a joining’). Among the definitions of *syllaba* in Late Antique Latin grammars, the only other instance of *iunctura* can be found in the grammar of Ps.-Asper;¹⁰ in addition to this, both Charisius and Dositheus use forms of the verb *iungere* in their definitions of *syllaba*.¹¹ Furthermore, the term *iunctura* appears in the definitions of *soloecismus*,¹² *uersus*, and *rhythmus*.¹³

The manuscript in which the *APS* has been preserved contains the reading *conpulatio* instead of *copulatio*. The reason for this mistake is most likely the confusion of another symbol for an abbreviation stroke denoting a nasal consonant.

Next, the author further explains the formation and types of syllables.¹⁴ According to him, a syllable is formed simply from either one letter (or speech sound), such as *a* or *o*, or several letters (or speech sounds) like *ae* or *te*. Unlike a few other grammarians, the author of the *APS* does not discuss the maximum length of a single syllable.¹⁵ Nor does he stress, as do some other

⁷ Diomedes (*GL* 1: 427, 4–9): “*syllaba est proprie congregatio aut comprehensio litterarum <vel unius vocalis> enuntiatio temporum capax. fit autem ex omnibus vocalibus, etiam ex singulis, syllaba tam brevis quam longa et ex copulatione vocalium consonantiumque. syllabae autem dicuntur Graece παρὰ τὸ συλλαβάνειν τὰ γράμματα; Latine conexiones vel conceptiones dici possunt, quod litteras concipiant atque conectant.*” The term *copulatio* also appears in another definition in Diomedes’ grammar, that of *versus* (*GL* 1: 494, 10–11).

⁸ Marius Victorinus (4, 55M) refers to the joining of syllables with the term *copulatio* (cf. “...in copulatione syllabarum...”). Priscian (108, 2Pa) uses the term when discussing the joining of words.

⁹ Cf. Aphthonius (*GL* 6: 35, 12): “... *id est duarum consonantium copulatio*” or (*GL* 6: 47, 3–4): “*nam graeco sermone duorum pedum copulatio basis dicitur, veluti quidam gressus pedum*”.

¹⁰ *GL* 5: 548, 6–7: “*Syllaba est litterarum inter se coeuntium una iunctura vel enuntiatio litterarum cum adiectione temporis.*”

¹¹ See n. 3 above.

¹² The term occurs in the definitions of *soloecismus* in the grammars of Charisius (352, 32–34B) and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 453, 23).

¹³ These two last definitions appear in the metrical treatise of Aphthonius. See *GL* 6: 55, 11 for the definition of *versus* and *GL* 6: 41, 25–27 for the definition of *rhythmus*.

¹⁴ IV, 3–5: “*Syllaba aut littera fit, ut ‘a’, ‘o’, aut litteris, ut ‘ae’, ‘te’.* In breui autem syllaba tempus unum est, in longa duo.”

¹⁵ Cf., e.g., Marius Victorinus (5, 1M): “... *ut ea maxima est quae ex pluribus constat, ut ‘stirps’*” or Priscian (*GL* 2: 51, 13ff.): “*A singulis ... incipiens non plus quam ad sex litteras procedere syllaba potest in Latino sermone, ut ‘a, ab, arx, Mars, stans, stirps’.*”

grammarians, that a syllable cannot be formed without a vowel,¹⁶ although his examples obviously suggest that this is the case. The passage explaining the difference between long and short syllables (IV, 4–5) is almost identical with several corresponding passages in other Latin grammars.¹⁷ The content and terminology of this latter part (IV, 4–5) seem to be well established; already Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria* contains a similar discussion.¹⁸

After thus beginning his discussion on the syllable, the author of the *APS* abruptly moves on to discuss accentuation. This is most unusual: in discussions on the syllable included in the Latin *artes grammaticae*, the different types of syllables are discussed further and suitable examples are given. Most grammars also include a separate chapter on accentuation, usually entitled *de accentu* or *de accentibus*. Exceptions to this rule are relatively few:¹⁹ Ps.-Asper does not have a chapter on accent; his chapter on the syllable is preceded by a chapter on *littera* and followed by one on metrical feet (*de pedibus*). Augustine’s *Ars breuiata* only discusses *latinitas* before moving on to discuss the parts of speech. Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta artium* begins with chapters on *uox*, *ars*, and *littera*; accent does not receive a chapter of its own.²⁰ Priscian’s *Institutiones* does not have a chapter devoted to accentuation, and whether Sacerdos discussed it in the incompletely preserved first book of his work cannot be known for certain.²¹

For some reason, the author of the *APS* has merged material other grammarians usually

¹⁶ Cf., for example, Ps.-Asper’s grammar (GL 5: 548, 7–8): “*syllaba autem sine vocali littera vel litteris non potest fieri.*”

¹⁷ Almost identical passages can be found in, for instance, Charisius’ grammar (8, 17–18B and 9, 14–15B), Dositheus’ work (11, 8–9Bo), Victorinus’ grammar (GL 6: 197, 4–5), and Audax’s *Excerpta* (GL 7: 327, 20–21).

¹⁸ *Inst.* 9.4.47: “... *longam esse duorum temporum, breuem unius etiam pueri sciunt.*” Not every grammarian was, however, content with these two types of syllables. Priscian, for instance, thinks that there are several other possibilities (GL 2: 51, 25–53, 2): “*tempus unum vel duo vel etiam, ut quibusdam placet, unum semis vel duo semis et tria; unum, si vocalis est brevis per se, ut ‘amo’, vel si eam una consonans simplex consequitur, ut ‘caput’, unum semis in communibus syllabis, ... ut ‘lacrimae’. ... in longis natura vel positione duo sunt tempora, ut ‘do’, ‘ars’, duo semis, quando post vocalem natura longam una sequitur consonans, ut ‘sol’, tria, quando post vocalem natura longam duae consonantes sequuntur vel una duplex, ut ‘mons’, ‘rex’.*”

¹⁹ In Charisius’ grammar such a chapter has not been preserved, although, according to the index (3, 32B), it was originally included in book five of the work.

²⁰ Later, when discussing the parts of speech, Ps.-Probus lists *accentus* as an *accidens* in the chapter on the noun (GL 4: 51, 22), the pronoun (GL 4: 131, 7), the participle (GL 4: 138, 31), and the verb (GL 4: 155, 35), but in each case he postpones the discussion to another treatise. Cf. GL 4: 74, 33–34: “*De accentibus autem, quia non brevis ratio est, in metris cum syllabis competenter tractabimus.*”

²¹ See the preface to the third book to Sacerdos’ grammar, where he talks of undertaking the discussion of metre at that point, having discussed the precepts of *ars grammatica* in the first book. The beginning of the first book of Sacerdos’ grammar has been lost, and thus it is hard to say what exactly was included in the precepts discussed in that part. Sacerdos (GL 6: 496, 4–497, 2): “*cum de institutis artis grammaticae primo libro me tractavisse comperisset vir clarissimus Vranius, nec ei displicuisset, vel quod non absurde compositus, vel quod ad eius filium virum clarissimum mihi contubernalem et aetate paene studiisque coniunctum Gaianum scriptus esset, compulit ut etiam de nominum verborumque ratione nec non etiam de structurarum compositionibus exprimendis breuiter laborarem. ... nunc in hoc sive tertio siue novissimo artium libro, ab eodem summo viro commendatus vobis viris amplissimis, nobilitatis splendore praedito Maximo et omni laude praedicabili Simplicio, quorum et ad quos seria non nisi de litteris exerceantur, quoniam iubere dignati estis, me posse etiam de metris tractare iudicastis, breuiter esse componendum decrevi.*”

discuss in a separate chapter into the chapter entitled *de syllabis*. Perhaps, as we are dealing with a relatively short elementary grammar, there was an objective of keeping the amount of the preliminary material to the minimum. Another explanation is that some portion of the work may have been lost at some stage of the transmission of the text, and the remaining, acephalous section on accentuation could have been embedded in the chapter on the syllable, which shares some of the same terminology.²² However, as the author of the *APS* returns to the subject of accent again at end of the chapter (IV, 31–32), after a long discussion on syllables, this second theory seems less likely.

The discussion on accent begins with monosyllabic words.²³ This passage does not present any textual or doctrinal problems. What follows can be corroborated by similar material in other grammars, to the extent of including many of the same examples.²⁴

However, the section on the accentuation of disyllabic words which follows (IV, 8) has been transmitted to us in a rather corrupt state.²⁵ The manuscript reading for this passage is “*in disyllabis uero uocibus uos semper acuitur ut ille iste quisquis*”, which makes no sense as such. Also, only the acute accent (*acuitur*) is mentioned in conjunction with disyllabic words, even though the circumflex accent should also be included in the discussion.²⁶ According to Latin grammarians, a circumflex accent would fall on the first syllable of a disyllabic word, if the first syllable contained a long vowel and the second syllable was short, as exemplified by the noun *Roma*.²⁷ The examples appearing in the manuscript, *ille* (‘that’), *iste* (‘this’), and *quisquis* (‘whoever’), are all words with a short second syllable, but none of them has a long vowel in the first syllable. There is very probably something missing here, but in the absence of direct parallels, it is hard to say exactly what this might be.²⁸ The aforementioned examples are also all pronouns, while most of the examples in

²² For instance, *syllaba*, *breuis*, *longa*, and so on.

²³ IV, 6–8: “*In omnibus monosyllabis obseruabimus siue breues sint, siue positione longae fuerint, ut acuantur, sicuti ‘mel, fel, ars, nox’. Si uero natura longae fuerint, inflectuntur, ut ‘sol, res, spes’.*”

²⁴ Obviously, in the other grammars this material occurs in the chapter on accent. All of the examples in this passage (*mel, fel, ars, nox, sol, res, and spes*) can be found in various discussions on the accentuation of monosyllabic words, but not all at once. See, e.g., the discussion on accent by Diomedes, Dositheus, Audax, Donatus, and Victorinus.

²⁵ IV, 8: “*In disyllabis uero uocibus fuos semper acuitur ut ille iste quisquis† <***>*”.

²⁶ Cf., e.g., the discussion in Donatus’ *de accentibus* (609, 14–17H): “*in disyllabis, quae priorem productam habuerint et posteriorem correptam, priorem syllabam circumflectemus, ut meta, Creta; ubi posterior syllaba producta fuerit, acuemus priorem, siue illa correpta fuerit siue producta, ut nepos, leges; ubi ambae breues fuerint, acuemus priorem, ut bonus, malus.*” The describing of Latin accent in Latin grammars with a system adopted from the Greeks is problematic, as the two languages were very different. However, I will keep to the terminology in use in the Latin grammars of the period, instead of trying to modernize the terminology.

²⁷ Cf. the grammar of Dositheus (2, 20–22Bo): “*In disyllabis, si prior natura longa erit posteriore correpta, prior circumflectetur, ut hora Roma*”.

²⁸ Several types of disyllabic words should be discussed in the *APS*. Cf. the discussions occurring in the grammars of Donatus (see n. 26 above) or Diomedes, for instance: “*omnis vox dissyllaba priorem syllabam aut acuit aut flectit. acuit, vel cum brevis est utraque, ut deus citus datur arat; vel cum positione longa est utraque, ut sollers; vel alterutra positione longa, dum ne natura longa sit, prior, ut pontus, posterior, ut cohors. si uero prior syllaba natura longa et sequens brevis fuerit, flectitur prior, ut luna Roma*” (GL I: 431, 18–23).

comparable discussions on accent are nouns and adjectives (both covered by the Latin term *nomen*). It is, however, possible to find also pronouns as examples in a few discussions on accentuation.²⁹

In the next section (IV, 8–12), words containing more than two syllables are discussed.³⁰ Here the text is well preserved, and no significant changes have been made to it. The doctrine presented by the author of the *APS* once again corresponds to that found in other grammars discussing accentuation, although the discussion in the *APS* includes fewer types of polysyllabic words than, for instance, the works of Donatus, Diomedes, and Dositheus.³¹

The examples for the polysyllabic words are not all attested in other discussions on accent; in fact, the name *Messius* (IV, 12) is not attested in the *CGL* database at all. *Metellus* and *Catullus* appear also in Diomedes' discussion on accent, for instance, as does *Sergius*. The name *Valgius* appears in a different context elsewhere; unsurprisingly, it is used to introduce quotations from the writings of C. Valgius Rufus in Charisius' and Diomedes' works.³² The author of the *APS* uses the genitive forms *Othonis*,³³ *Neronis*, and *Catonis* to exemplify words that have the circumflex accent on the penultimate syllable. Genitive forms are not usually attested as examples of accentuation in the Late Latin grammars; nominative forms, such as *Romanus*, *Cethegus*, *marinus*, *Crispinus*, and *amicus*, are generally used instead.³⁴

To conclude the discussion on accent, the author of the *APS* adds one restriction to the rules of accentuation he has outlined.³⁵ According to him, these rules do not apply to certain adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, or interjections. Such exceptions are relatively common, and most

²⁹ Cf. the *Fragmentum Bobiense de accentibus* (GL 7: 539, 22–23): “... si positione longa fuerint aut certe brevia, acuta voce pronuntiabuntur, ut [non] néc quis quid híc nix” and Ps.-Priscian's *De accentibus* (GL 3: 528, 17–21): “pronomen vero similiter eisdem regulis utitur. notandum est namque, quod illa pronomina, quae in ultimis accentum seruant, sic uti huic nostras vestras, ideo haec apud modernos ita habent, quia apud antiquissimos huicce et nostratis vestratis declinabatur. retinet namque accentum in ultimo, quem habebant in paenultimo.” This last passage however, specifically concerns pronouns, so one would obviously expect only pronouns to occur as examples here.

³⁰ IV, 8–12: “In trisyllabis autem et tetrasyllabis et plurimarum syllabarum secunda ab ultima obseruanda est; haec si natura longa fuerit, inflectitur, ut ‘Othonis, Neronis, Catonis’. Si uero positione longa fuerit, acuitur ipsa, sicuti ‘Metellus, Catullus, gemellus’. Si uero brevis fuerit, ante se quaerit syllabam, ut eam acuet, sicuti ‘Valgius, Messius, Sergius’.”

³¹ Dositheus (2, 33ff.Bo), for instance, adds one more type to the three covered by the *APS* (as well as some Greek types): “si autem longa fuerit ultima, paenultimae acutum dabimus accentum <ut Athenae, Fidenae>. Graeca nomina si isdem litteris proferentur, graecos accentus habebunt. ...”. Also Donatus adds two types to the three discussed in the *APS*, namely those where the accent is different because of the combination *muta cum liquida* or because of a long vowel in the last syllable (610, 3–7H): “si positione longa non ex muta et liquida fuerit; nam mutabit accentum, ut latebrae, tenebrae; ... si ultima quoque natura longa fuerit, paenultima acuetur, ut Athenae, Mycenae.”

³² C. Valgius Rufus, a poet and author, born in c. 65 BC, is quoted five times by Charisius and once by Diomedes.

³³ According to the *CGL* database, the name *Otho* is attested in only once, in Velius Longus' *De orthographia* (GL 7: 69, 17).

³⁴ Cf., e.g., the discussions in the works of Diomedes (GL 1: 431, 24–26), Donatus (610, 6H), Audax (GL 7: 330, 11) and Victorinus (GL 6: 193, 12).

³⁵ IV, 12–14: “Hac autem lege non tenentur quaedam aduerbiorum, item coniunctionum, nec minus praepositionum, item interiectionum syllabarum.”

discussions on accent add some provision, like Diomedes', for instance: "*in Latinis [sc. verbis] neque acutus accentus in ultima syllaba potest poni nisi discretionis causa, ut in adverbio pone, ideo ne verbum putetur, et in quibusdam praepositionibus.*" *GL* 1: 433, 5–7).³⁶

After the digression on accent, the author of the *APS* concentrates on the syllable again, beginning the discussion on short and long syllables (IV, 15ff.). First, he briefly describes short syllables and the long syllables containing either a long vowel or a diphthong. Then he embarks on a lengthy account of the so-called *syllabae positione longae* (syllables considered long because of their position). According to the author of the *APS*, there are eight different contexts that produce long syllables of this type. There is some disagreement among Latin grammarians as to the exact number of such contexts,³⁷ but the *APS* is not the only grammar to give their number as eight.³⁸

There are two emendations of note in the passage on lines 15–18. On line 15, I have emended the manuscript reading *litterae* to *syllabae*. This is more in line with the content of this section, as the adjectives *longa* ('long') and *brevis* ('short') defining the subject of the sentence always refer to syllables in this passage, whereas vowels (here *litterae*) are described as *correpta* and *producta* ('pronounced long/short'). On line 17, the manuscript reading *atra* has been emended to "*ta, ra*", as the original reading does not illustrate the two types of syllable the author has just described.³⁹

Unlike most grammarians discussing syllables,⁴⁰ the author of the *APS* does not discuss the so-called middle syllables (*syllabae mediae* or *communes*).⁴¹ However, as the *APS* is not alone in leaving them out, we are probably not dealing with an omission in the text.⁴² After naming the subtypes of syllables as long and short, the author of the *APS* describes short syllables. According to him, short syllables are formed with either a single short vowel, exemplified by *a* and *e*, or a short vowel preceded by semivowels or mutes (that is, the two types of consonants), exemplified by

³⁶ "In Latin words, the acute accent cannot fall on the final syllable, unless for the sake of telling words apart. This is the case with the adverb *pone* ('behind'), that it might not be thought a verb (*pone* = 'put!'), and with some prepositions." For similar passages, see also the grammars of Dositheus (3, 5–9Bo), Audax (*GL* 7: 330, 17–19), Victorinus (*GL* 6: 193, 18–20), Cledonius (*GL* 5: 33, 27–31), and Ps.-Priscian (*GL* 3: 528, 17ff.).

³⁷ Many grammarians, such as Dositheus and Donatus, are content with listing just four different contexts. Some writers list six, like Fortunatianus, or seven, like Diomedes, or even ten, like Victorinus and Audax.

³⁸ IV, 19ff: "*Positione longae syllabae octo modis fiunt: ...*". Also, e.g., Marius Victorinus (5, 7–11M), Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 548, 11–29), and Cledonius (*GL* 5: 28, 29ff.) list eight types of contexts that produce long vowels.

³⁹ I would like to thank Prof. Mario De Nonno for suggesting the emendation (*ta, ra*) and also Dr. Jaana Vaahtera for her remark on the fact that a feminine form (*atra*) would have been a very unusual example in a context where such a form is not required.

⁴⁰ For instance, Ps.-Dionysius Thrax, Donatus, Marius Victorinus, Charisius, and Dositheus.

⁴¹ For the definition and the diverse accounts of the *syllabae mediae/communes* in Latin grammarians, see Schad (2007: s.v. *communis* 6).

⁴² The *artes* of Ps.-Asper, Victorinus, and Audax do not discuss the *syllabae communes*. The *Ars metrica* of Fortunatianus also omits them. Problems in the transmission of the *APS*, such as an omission, cannot be ruled out completely, however, as the *syllabae communes* were often treated in a chapter of their own (with no specific mention of them at the beginning of the chapter on the syllable proper). See, e.g., Dositheus (*De communibus syllabis*, 12, 1ff.Bo) and Charisius (10, 18ff.B).

ta and *ra*. There are several descriptions of *syllaba brevis* in Late Latin grammars, but none that exactly match the one appearing in the *APS*. The most widely appearing description states merely that a short syllable is produced (*efficit*) by a short vowel.⁴³ Another definition for a short syllable occurs in the grammars of Donatus and Diomedes, for instance.⁴⁴ This definition states that a short syllable must have a short vowel and must not be followed by two consonants, a double consonant, or anything that can stand for such. The definition appearing in Charisius' and Dositheus' grammars is closest in its content to the definition of the short syllable in the *APS*.

There is more uniformity as regards the definition of the long syllable.⁴⁵ The definition appearing in the *APS* reads as follows: "*Natura longae fiunt, cum uocali producta constant, ut 'o', aut pluribus uocalibus longam syllabam facientibus, ut 'ae, tae, uae'*" (IV, 17–18).⁴⁶ If not in its wording, in its content, at least, this definition corresponds to most of the others appearing in the *artes grammaticae*.⁴⁷

Next, the author enumerates the different contexts that give rise to syllables considered long, not by virtue of possessing a long vowel or a diphthong, but by virtue of the letters (or speech sounds) that follow them. This is a rather lengthy passage (IV, 19–30) containing a number of literary quotations, from Virgil's *Aeneid*, to illustrate the different types.

The discussion of the first type of the total of eight contains some textual problems. The manuscript reading is "*primo fit quotiens litteras breues consonante finitur littera et excipitur a consonanti m*". I have emended the reading *litteras breues* to *syllaba breuis*, based on the context and the fact that the adjective *breuis* modifies the noun *syllaba* in this chapter, whereas *correpta* usually modifies the noun *littera* (or *littera uocalis*). The phrase *syllaba breuis* also agrees with the predicate verb *finitur*, unlike the plural form *litteras*.

⁴³ See, for instance, Marius Victorinus: "*Breues [sc. syllabas] autem correpta uocalis efficit*," (5, 26M). Such a definition occurs, in addition to Marius Victorinus' grammar, in that of Charisius, Dositheus, Victorinus, and Audax.

⁴⁴ Donatus: "*breues sunt, quae et correptam uocalem habent et non desinunt in duas consonantes aut in unam duplicem aut in aliquid, quod sit pro duabus consonantibus*" (605, 13–14H). See also the definition in Diomedes' work (*GL* 1: 427, 11–12), in Servius' commentary (*GL* 4: 423, 22ff.), and another definition in the grammar of Marius Victorinus: "*Ex his breues uno modo sunt, id est cum uocalis corripitur, quam non sequuntur duae consonantes*" (5, 3M).

⁴⁵ I refer to the so-called *syllaba natura longa* ('long syllable by virtue of the length of the vowel/diphthong it contains').

⁴⁶ "Syllables are considered long by nature, if they consist of a long vowel, such as *ō*, or of several vowels forming a long syllable, such as *ae, tae, or uae*."

⁴⁷ Cf. the definition in Donatus' *Ars maior*, for instance: "*longae aut natura sunt aut positione fiunt: natura, cum aut uocalis producitur, ut a o, aut duae uocales iunguntur et diphthongon faciunt, ut ae oe au eu ei*:" (605, 15–606, 1H) = Diomedes (*GL* 1: 427, 12–14), and Dositheus: "*Syllabae aut natura longae sunt, aut positione. Natura longae fiunt, cum singulae uocales litterae producuntur, ut a et e, aut cum duae, ut ua, aut cum tres, ut uae*" (11, 10–13Bo) = Charisius (8, 19–21B). There is also another similar definition in Charisius (9, 15–17B): "*natura longae syllabae aut ex una producta uocali sunt, ut e vel o, aut ex duabus iunctis, ae vel oe, quas graeci diphthongos vocant*." See also Marius Victorinus (5, 5–6M) and Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 548, 9–11). Audax and Victorinus list as many as five types of *syllaba natura longa*, whereas some writers, like Fortunatianus and Marius Victorinus, give very simple definitions, such as: "*natura, cum uocalis extenditur*:" (*GL* 6: 279, 27) ≈ Marius Victorinus (5, 27M).

The other problem in this section (IV, 19–20) concerns its content. A short syllable ending in one consonant but followed by a consonant belonging to the next syllable (*excipitur*),⁴⁸ becomes *syllaba positione longa* ('long by virtue of its position'). This is the doctrine found in most grammars discussing this issue in detail.⁴⁹ The most popular example quoted to illustrate this rule is "*arma virumque cano*" (*Aen.* 1.1) or just *arma*.⁵⁰ The *APS* gives the same rule in a slightly different form: a short syllable ending in one consonant but followed by the consonant *m* belonging to the next syllable becomes long by virtue of its position. Either the author of the *APS* was influenced by material in other grammars (almost always quoting the example *arma*) into thinking this is the only situation in which the syllable becomes long by virtue of its position, or there could be an omission in the text. A passage from the grammar of Ps.-Asper discussing the same phenomenon could hint at a solution. Instead of merely quoting the example (*arma virumque cano*), he explains it further: "*et excipitur ab altera consonante, ut 'arma uirumque cano'. ar enim natura brevis est, tamen positione fit longa, quia desinit in consonantem r et excipitur a consonante m*" (*GL* 5: 548, 12–15).⁵¹ This kind of a discussion could also be missing from the *APS*, only omitted due to a *saut du même au même* (that is, from the word form *consonanti* to another instance of the same word). An omission like this would also explain the fact that this first type is lacking an example, whereas all of the seven types to follow have at least one example, in the form of a quotation from Virgil. However, there is a problem in subscribing to this theory; Ps.-Asper adds explanations also to some of the other eight types he discusses,⁵² whereas the author of the *APS* does not. A simpler solution to rectify the situation is merely to delete the letter *m* from the text, thus making the doctrine presented in the *APS* more in line with the majority of the grammarians discussing this issue.

The second context that produces long syllables is created when a syllable with a short vowel ends in two consonants. The examples quoted here are *ast* ('but') and *est* ('there is'), followed by two Virgil quotations containing these words.⁵³ In this case the doctrine presented in the *APS* is not at odds with that occurring in other grammars; even the same examples can be found in some of them, *Aen.* 1.46 in the grammar of Ps.-Asper and *Aen.* 1.159 in the works of Diomedes, Charisius,

⁴⁸ The verb *excipitur* refers to the letters that follow. Cf. *TLL*: 5, II, 1254, 26ff.

⁴⁹ For instance, in Diomedes' work: "*si desinat in consonantem et excipiatur a consonanti, ut 'a r m a':*" (*GL* I: 428, 6). See also Charisius (9,18–21B), Victorinus (*GL* 6: 197, 10–12) = Audax (*GL* 7: 328, 5–6), Marius Victorinus (5, 8M), Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 548, 12–16), and Ps.-Probus (*De ultimis syllabis*, *GL* 4: 256, 22–24).

⁵⁰ Charisius and Ps.-Asper have "*arma virumque cano*", Ps.-Probus has "*arma virumque ferens*" (*Aen.* 11.747), whereas Diomedes, Victorinus, Audax, and Marius Victorinus have just *arma*. Marius Victorinus also includes another example, *Anna*.

⁵¹ "And it is followed by another consonant, as in '*arma virumque cano*'. Ar is by nature a short syllable, but it becomes long due to its position, because it ends in the consonant *r* and is followed by the consonant *m*."

⁵² Cf. "*quoties excipitur a duabus consonantibus, ut 'Atrides Proti'; nam etsi a correpta est, tamen positione fit longa, quia sequuntur t et r:*" (*GL* 5: 548, 19–21). He gives additional explanations in three of the eight cases he discusses.

⁵³ "*Ast ego, quae diuum incedo regina*" (*Aen.* 1.46) and "*est in secessu longo locus*" (*Aen.* 1.159).

and Marius Victorinus.

The third case is similar to the first two. In this case the short vowel is followed by two consonants in the next syllable (*excipitur a duabus consonantibus*). Again the doctrine is very similar to that present in other grammars.⁵⁴ The same literary quotations (*Aen.* 7.410. and *Aen.* 11.262) can also be found in several of them.⁵⁵

The fourth type of *syllaba positione longa* is created when a syllable with a short vowel ends in a double letter (that is, the letter *x*). The *APS* gives as an example for this type verse *Aen.* 2.169.⁵⁶ The most common example among Latin grammarians seems to be *nox erat* or just *nox*.⁵⁷ The example quoted by the *APS* (*Aen.* 2.169) is not attested in the *CGL* database at all.

The fifth type also concerns the double letter, *x*,⁵⁸ but this time it follows in the next syllable (*a sequenti duplici littera excipitur*). Most grammarians give the noun *axis* ('heavens') as the example at this instance.⁵⁹ Only the *APS* and Ps.-Asper give the line *Aen.* 7.359.⁶⁰

The sixth type of *syllaba positione longa* involves the consonants that share their graphic form with the vowels *i* and *u* (IV, 26–28). The text of the *APS* omits the fact that the short syllable in question should end in a consonant, which is then followed by the consonant *j* or *v* (written as *i* and *u*).⁶¹ This fact can, however, be gleaned from the examples provided for this phenomenon. Diomedes, Donatus, and Audax all have similar examples in their discussions, but only the author of the *APS* quotes the whole verses (*Aen.* 1.411 and *Aen.* 12.134).⁶²

The seventh type of syllable considered long due to its position is brought about when a syllable ending in a short vowel is followed by the letter *i* (standing for the consonant *j*).⁶³ This is

⁵⁴ Even the wording in many of the similar passages is very close to the *APS*. See, for instance, Ps.-Asper's *ars*: "*tertio modo longa syllaba est positione, quoties excipitur a duabus consonantibus, ut 'Atrides Proti';*" (*GL* 5: 548, 18–20).

⁵⁵ For *Aen.* 11.262, see the previous note. For *Aen.* 7.410, see Marius Victorinus (5, 8M and 5, 32M), Diomedes (*GL* 1: 428, 4–5), Charisius (9, 24–25B), and Ps.-Probus (*De ult.*, *GL* 4: 256, 29–31).

⁵⁶ IV, 24–25: "*ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa [se] referri*".

⁵⁷ "*Nox erat*" begins the verses *Aen.* 3.147 and *Aen.* 8. 26. That example can be found in the grammars of Diomedes (*GL* 1: 428, 7), Charisius (9, 26–27B), and Marius Victorinus (5, 33M), as well as *De ultimis syllabis* by Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 256, 32–33). *Nox* can be found in Audax's *Excerpta* (*GL* 7: 328, 6–7), Victorinus' grammar (*GL* 6: 197, 12–13), and Marius Victorinus' work (5, 9M).

⁵⁸ Some grammarians also include examples featuring the letter *z* among the examples quoted, cf. e.g., Marius Victorinus (5, 34M), Charisius (9, 28–30B), Audax (*GL* 7: 328, 7), Victorinus (*GL* 6: 197, 14) and Ps.-Probus (*De ult. syll.*, *GL* 4: 256, 34–257, 4).

⁵⁹ For instance, Diomedes, Marius Victorinus, and Victorinus. Ps.-Probus has "*axem humero torquet*" (*Aen.* 4. 482 & 6.798) in his *De ultimis syllabis* (*GL* 4: 256, 33–34).

⁶⁰ Cf. IV, 26 and Ps.-Asper: "*quinto, quoties syllaba excipitur a duplici littera, ut 'exulibusne datur ducenda Lavinia Teucris'*" (*GL* 5: 548, 22–24).

⁶¹ Although the *APS* is not alone in inaccurately describing this phenomenon. See, e.g., Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 548, 24–25).

⁶² Diomedes has *at Venus* and *at Iuno* (*GL* 1: 428, 10), as does Donatus (606, 3–4H). Audax has *arva* and *at Iuno* (*GL* 7: 328, 9).

⁶³ The *APS* does not mention that the letter *i* stands for the consonant in this case, but other grammarians treating this issue add the information, e.g., Marius Victorinus (5, 38M): "...*i littera vice posita consonantis*".

the doctrine offered by the majority of the grammarians discussing the subject.⁶⁴ Victorinus, Audax, and Marius Victorinus have a slightly different theory; according to them, the letter *i* is doubled, and this is reflected in the spelling of the examples quoted to support this theory (e.g., *Troïia*).⁶⁵ The example quoted in the *APS*, “*Troïaque nunc stare*” (*Aen.* 2.56),⁶⁶ occurs also in the grammars of Ps.-Asper, Diomedes, Audax, and Victorinus.⁶⁷

The last type of syllable considered long because of its position once again presents some problems. Even though the verse quoted as an example here, “*hoc erat, alma parens*” (*Aen.* 2.664),⁶⁸ is popular in grammars discussing these syllables, the doctrine presented along with it is often conflicting. Charisius, for instance, gives the rule as follows: when a word ends in a short syllable with the consonant *c* as the last letter and the next word begins with a vowel, the short syllable is pronounced long.⁶⁹ However, this view is contradicted later in his grammar.⁷⁰ Some grammarians offer as the explanation for the long syllable the fact that the letter *c* in the pronoun *hoc* would actually represent a double consonant;⁷¹ the author of the *APS* prefers to explain the existence of the long syllable with the fact that the syllable ends the word.⁷²

The last two lines in this chapter (IV, 31–32) concern, once again, accentuation;⁷³ they would seem more at home at the end of the section on accent (IV, 14). The passage betrays signs of

⁶⁴ Although Diomedes adds that a vowel should also follow the letter *i* (*GL* 1: 428, 10–14): “*septimo, cum correpta vocalis desinat et interposita i excipitur a vocali, ut furias Aiakis Oilei et Troïaque nunc stares ...*”.

⁶⁵ Victorinus (*GL* 6: 197, 16–19): “*aut cum correpta vocalis desinit in vocalem loco consonantis positam et excipitur aequae a vocali loco consonantis posita, ut ‘maior agit deus’ et ‘Troïaque nunc stares’ (sic enim ista scribi per geminam i litteram metri ratio deposcit)*” = Audax (*GL* 7: 328, 9–12). Also Marius Victorinus subscribes to this view (5, 11M): “*octavo, si excipitur ab i littera duplicata, ut ‘Troïa, aïo, Graïus, Aïiax’.*” In his brief account on the syllable position longae Donatus also mentions this possibility (606, 5–7H): “*aut in i litteram solam loco consonantis positam, quam nonnulli geminant, ut ‘aïo te, Aeacida, Romanos uincere posse’.*”

⁶⁶ “And Troy were standing ... this day”, (translated by Williams 1910).

⁶⁷ In these grammars the form of the quotation differs slightly from the one preserved in the manuscript M. Whereas the *APS* has the reading *staret*, adopted by the editor (Mynors) and preserved in most of the early MSS of the *Aeneid* as well as Servius’ commentary, the other grammarians transmit the reading *stares*, which is rejected by the editor, even though it too is attested in some of the fourth century MSS (Mynors 1969: 128).

⁶⁸ *Aen.* 2.664: “*hoc erat, alma parens quod me per tela, per ignis*”. This verse (or parts of it) appears in the *CGL* database over 20 times. I also included in this number the instances where the beginning of the verse is spelled *hocc erat*.

⁶⁹ 8, 27–9, 4B: “*item cum desinit in consonantem c qua pars orationis finitur <et> excipitur a vocali, ut (A. 2, 664) ‘hoc erat, alma parens’.*”

⁷⁰ Charisius (13, 5–12B): “*si autem facies: ‘nec erit alma parens’ aut: ‘nec ait et nostris’, iam speciem suam versus amittet, cum aequae et hanc et illam syllabas constet esse correptas. ergo illae non ideo longae fiunt, quod pars orationis finitur, ut putant plurimi; nam idem et in hac effici posset; sed, ut dixi, in pronominiibus c littera sonum efficit crassiorem et naturam i litterae inter vocales positae ac per hoc sonum geminantis imitatur.*” Already Velius Longus (*GL* 7: 54, 6–13) wrote on this problem and also quoted *Aen.* 2.664.

⁷¹ Marius Victorinus (5, 10M): “*sexto, si desinit in consonantem quae duarum sonum praebeat, ut ‘hocc erat’.*”

⁷² IV, 30: “*... syllabam efficit, qua pars orationis finiatur*”. Cf. also Aphthonius (*GL* 6: 36, 6–8): “*octavo, si correpta vocalis desinit in consonantem, qua pars orationis finiatur, et sequens syllaba a vocali incipiat, ut ‘hoc erat’ et ‘hic ait’.*”

⁷³ IV, 31–32: “*Omnes syllabae aut acuto, aut graui, aut inflexo <accentu> proferuntur, ita ut in nulla parte orationis plus una flexa <uel acuta> appareat.*”

confusion, and, to address them, some emendations have been made to these lines. I have changed the reading *inflexosa* to *inflexo* <accentu>. *Inflexus*, along with *circumflexus* and *flexus*, is a term used to denote the circumflex accent.⁷⁴ The verb form *ferunt* has been emended to *proferuntur* (‘are pronounced’), which is more in line with the content of the passage. The transitive verb *ferre* would also require an accusative object not found in this passage. Finally, the words *uel acuta* have been added to complete the sentence on line 32.⁷⁵ No exact parallels for these lines can be found in the corpus of Late Latin grammars.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ See Schad (2007: s.v. *circumflexus*, *inflexus*, and *flexus*).

⁷⁵ I would like to thank Prof. Mario De Nonno for suggesting this emendation to complete the sentence on lines 31–32.

⁷⁶ The same topic appears in many Late Latin grammars, but no exact parallels can be found. Cf. the following passages in the works of, e.g., Victorinus (*GL* 6: 192, 16–18) = Audax (*GL* 7: 329, 14–16): “*in omni parte orationis latinae, item et graecae, aut acutum aut circumflexum accentum poni necesse est, nec amplius quam unum, vel hunc vel illum. nam gravis ponitur in pluribus*” or Servius (*GL* 4: 426, 15–16): “*unus autem sermo unum recipit accentum, vel acutum vel circumflexum; utrumque autem simul habere non potest.*”

3.5 De dictione, de locutione, de definitione, de oratione

Before proceeding to discuss the parts of speech – a discussion that takes up most of the *APS* – the author lists four definitions. The definitions of *dictio*, *locutio*, *definitio*, and *oratio* conclude the introductory part of the *APS*. There does not seem to have been any specific pattern for this section of the Latin *artes grammaticae* such that it would show up in every specimen of the genre. Thus among the extant grammars we find a wealth of variation.

The first of the four definitions included at this point is that of *dictio*. It is logical that the definition of *dictio* should follow the discussion on *syllabae* in the *APS*, as *dictio* (‘word’) is composed of syllables. This fact was already mentioned in the chapter on *uox* at the beginning of the *APS*.¹ The following Latin grammarians also include a definition of *dictio* in their works: Charisius, Diomedes, Dositheus, Priscian, and Marius Victorinus. The extant definitions can be roughly grouped into three types. Firstly, Charisius, Dositheus, and Diomedes² quote the same definition of *dictio*, which emphasizes both the fact that a word is composed of syllables and that it has a precise meaning (*cum significatione certa*).³ Priscian, echoing the definition used by Ps.-Dionysius, defines *dictio* as the smallest part of the *oratio constructa* (‘properly constructed utterance’).⁴ Finally, Marius Victorinus, the *APS*, and a papyrus fragment, P. Lit. London 184,⁵ contain definitions of *dictio* that are strikingly similar to each other.

The definition of *dictio* occurring in the *APS* is the following: “*Dictio est uox figuram habens significantium uocum.*”⁶ The definition appearing in the papyrus fragment is apparently identical to this.⁷ The papyrus is not perfectly preserved, and any sensible reading requires some amount of reconstruction.⁸ However, Law is probably right in rejecting the reading *oris uox* offered by Wouters (1979: 97), as that reading is not corroborated by the wording of the definitions occurring

¹ II, 8–10: “*Ita enim uoce constant litterae, litteris syllabae, syllabis exprimitur uel breuis dictio uel numerosa, quae multiplicem compleat orationem.*”

² Diomedes also includes another definition in his discussion on *dictio*. This definition does not appear in any other grammar (*GL* I: 436, 10–11): “*Dictio est vox articulata cum aliqua significatione ex qua instruitur oratio et in quam resolvitur.*”

³ Charisius (14, 26–27B): “*dictio est ex syllabis finita cum significatione certa locutio, ut est dico facio*” = Dositheus (13, 2–3Bo) = Diomedes (*GL* I: 436, 11–12).

⁴ *GL* 2, 53, 8–9: “*dictio est pars minima orationis constructae, id est in ordine compositae*”. Cf. the definition of λέξις appearing in the grammar of Ps.-Dionysius: “λέξις ἐστὶ μέρος ἐλάχιστον τοῦ κατὰ σύνταξιν λόγου” (*GG* 1/1, 22, 3ff.).

⁵ Wouters (1979: 93) dates the fragment to c. 200 AD.

⁶ “The word is an utterance that contains the form of signifying sound.”

⁷ See Law (1987: 85): “The definition of *dictio* agrees exactly with that found in M [the *APS*]: *dictio est uox figuram habens significantium uocum.*”

⁸ The edition by Wouters (1979: 97–98) reads “*dictio oris uox figuram habens significantium uocum.*”

in Marius Victorinus' grammar or the *APS*.⁹ The definition of *dictio* found in Marius Victorinus' grammar is also somewhat problematic. The passage where it is transmitted is corrupt, and the two editors of the text reach different conclusions as to the definition of *dictio*.¹⁰ Law prefers the emendation by Keil (1987: 85 n. 59), which combines the phrase "*aut initium a quo sumit incrementum et in quod resolvitur*" not with the definition of *dictio*, but with that of *elementum*, as in several other grammars, thus making the definition of *dictio* more similar to the ones in the *APS* and P. Lit. London 184. Mariotti's argumentation also has its merits, however, and his views cannot be completely neglected. In his commentary of Marius Victorinus' *ars grammatica*, Mariotti argues for a similarity between his reconstruction and the definition of *dictio* preserved in Diomedes' grammar (*GL 1*: 436, 10–11, see n. 2). The reconstruction by Mariotti is also closer to the manuscript reading than that by Keil. To me, however, the fact that the definition of *dictio* preserved in Marius Victorinus' grammar is very similar to the one that appears in the *APS* is of interest here, even if the similarity is only partial.

The definition of *dictio* occurring in the *APS* emphasizes the fact that a word is connected to signifying sound (*uox significans*).¹¹ Interestingly, in addition to the definitions of *dictio* listed above, the phrase *uox significans* is attested in the treatise by Velius Longus in a definition of *littera* (*littera est initium vocis significantis*).¹² The corresponding Greek phrase (*φωνή σημαντική*) can be found in the *Vitae philosophorum* of Diogenes Laertius (7.56), but there it is connected with the term *λόγος* ('statement'), comparable with *oratio*, not *λέξις*, which would correspond to *dictio*.¹³ As for the term *figura* ('form'), which appears in the definition of *dictio* in the *APS*, it is hard to say with much certainty what exactly that term alludes to in this context. The term refers to 'written form' in conjunction with *littera*.¹⁴ This interpretation would seem to find support also in Diogenes Laertius (7.56), where *λέξις* is described as *φωνή ἐγγράμματος* ('sound expressed in letters'). But the term *figura* is used by Varro and the later grammarians in a wealth of different senses: with reference to inflectional form, derivational form, forms of comparison, phonological form, *et*

⁹ Cf. Law (1987: 85 n. 58).

¹⁰ Keil includes the following definition in his edition: "*Dictio <est> figura significantium vocum*" (*GL 6*: 5, 2), whereas Mariotti includes an additional part to the definition, which Keil had included into the definition of *elementum*: "*dictio figura significantium vocum aut initium a quo sumit incrementum et in quod resolvitur <oratio>*" (2, 8M).

¹¹ In his commentary on the *ars grammatica* of Marius Victorinus, Mariotti concentrates mainly on his emendation of the corrupt passage, which thus becomes the second part of the definition of *dictio* ("*...aut initium a quo sumit incrementum et in quod resolvitur <oratio>*") (1967: 131–132). He does not analyze the first part of the definition which is preserved intact ("*dictio figura significantium vocum*") and the terminology appearing there (*figura*, *uox significans*), nor does he anywhere mention the similarity between the definition of *dictio* in Marius Victorinus' grammar and P. Lit. London 184.

¹² See Schad (2007: s.v. *significans*). She equates *uox significans* with *uox articulata*.

¹³ 7.56: "*λόγος δὲ ἐστὶ φωνὴ σημαντικὴ ἀπὸ διανοίας ἐκπεπομένη, οἷον Ἡμέρα ἐστί.*" The term *λέξις*, on the other hand, is described as sound expressed with letters: "*λέξις δὲ ἐστὶν, ὥς φησι Διογένης, φωνὴ ἐγγράμματος, οἷον Ἡμέρα.*"

¹⁴ See Schad (2007: s.v. *figura 4 i*).

cetera.¹⁵

The next definition appearing in the *APS* also concerns the word. The definition of *locutio* immediately follows that of *dictio*. Both *dictio* and *locutio* could be used as synonyms for the more prevalent term *uerbum*, which stands for ‘verb’ in addition to ‘word’ and could thus create confusion.¹⁶ That two definitions of word should be included here is odd; all the more so as no other surviving grammar contains a definition for the second of the two terms denoting ‘word’, *locutio*.¹⁷ A mistake in the transmission of the text could, perhaps, account for this: *locutio* might be a corrupt form of the term *elocutio* (‘speech’ or ‘phrase’). However, we can easily refute such a theory; the definition that follows is clearly that of ‘word’ (VI, 3): “*Locutio est uox litteris et syllabis conligata simplicis intellectus*.”¹⁸

The definition of *locutio* occurring in the *APS* is rather similar to the definition of *dictio* appearing in Charisius’ grammar, for instance (see n. 17). In both instances a word is said to be formed from syllables, although the definition in the *APS* also mentions letters as constituents of the word. Both definitions also emphasize the fact that a word has a certain meaning, even though the wording in the two definitions is very different.¹⁹

The next definition to be included in this section is that of definition (*definitio*). A definition for the term *definitio* appears in several other Latin grammars besides the *APS*. There are only two definitions of *definitio* appearing in Latin grammars: one ascribed to Cicero,²⁰ quoted by Diomedes and Marius Victorinus,²¹ and another one, for which a source is not known, which occurs in the works of Charisius, Diomedes, Victorinus, and Audax in addition to the *APS*. The addition of *oratio* on line VII, 3 is corroborated by the other instances of this definition.²²

¹⁵ See Schad (2007: s.v. *figura* 1, 2).

¹⁶ Cf. the following passage from Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.5.2): “*Verba nunc generaliter accipi volo: nam duplex eorum intellectus est, alter qui omnia per quae sermo nequitur significat, ... alter in quo est una pars orationis: ‘lego’ ‘scribo’; quam vitantes ambiguitatem quidam dicere maluerunt voces, locutiones, dictiones.*” *Locutio* could also mean ‘phrase’. See Schad (2007: s.v. *locutio* 2).

¹⁷ *Locutio* appears in the definition of *dictio* transmitted by Charisius (14, 26–27B), Dositheus (13, 2–3Bo), and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 436, 11–12): “*dictio est ex syllabis finita cum significatione certa locutio, ut est dico facio.*”

¹⁸ “The word is an utterance of connected letters and syllables which has a single meaning.”

¹⁹ Whereas Charisius’ definition of *dictio* indicates this with the words *cum significatione certa (locutio)*, the definition of *locutio* in the *APS* has the words (*uox*) *simplicis intellectus* instead. *Significatio* and *intellectus* can be synonyms, cf. Schad (2007: s.v. *intellectus* 2). See also the discussion in Moussy (1999: 23–26).

²⁰ Diomedes (*GL* 1: 421, 1–2): “*Cicero sic eam definit, ‘definitio est oratio quae quid sit de quo agitur ostendit quam brevissime’.*” Marius Victorinus (1, 7M): “*‘Definitio est’, ut ait Cicero, ‘oratio quae quid sit de quo agitur ostendit quam brevissime’.*” The definition occurs in Cicero’s *Orator* (116).

²¹ Marius Victorinus’ *liber de definitionibus* contains a different definition, also originating from Cicero: “*‘Definitio est’ ut Tullius in Topicis ait ‘oratio quae id quod definit explicat quid sit’.*” (332, 3–4 (Stangl 1888)).

²² The definition appearing in the *APS* is the following (VII, 3): “*Definitio est <oratio> quae id de quo quaeritur aperte describit et explet et determinat.*” Cf. the definition appearing in Charisius’ grammar, for instance: “*Definitio est oratio*

Before proceeding to the discussion of the *partes orationis*, the author of the *APS* adds the definition of *oratio* ('connected speech') as the last definition in this preliminary section. It would make sense to give some description of *oratio* before listing the *partes orationis* ('parts of speech') and then moving on to discuss them individually. In fact, many grammarians do exactly that: for instance, Charisius, Dositheus, and Ps.-Dionysius Thrax²³ have arranged their grammars in this way. However, other grammarians, such as Donatus, Ps.-Asper, Augustine, and Ps.-Probus, omit the definition of *oratio* and merely list the parts of speech before moving on to discuss them. The *APS* does not contain a list of the parts of speech following the definition of *oratio*, but such a list may have originally formed part of the *APS*, as the text is rather corrupt at this point – a fact to which Law also alludes in her article (1987: 82).²⁴

The definition of *oratio* occurring in the *APS* reads as follows: "*Oratio est significantibus uocibus secundum rationem ordinata sententia*".²⁵ This definition is not attested in other Latin grammars. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, not all *artes grammaticae* contain a definition of *oratio*. Of those that do, four repeat a definition of *oratio* that Diomedes²⁶ attributes to Scaurus.²⁷ That definition bears no resemblance to the one appearing in the *APS*, except for the occurrence of the word *ordinata* in both definitions.²⁸ Also, the definition appearing in the grammars of Victorinus and Audax offers no points of contact to the one occurring in the *APS*.²⁹ The definition of *oratio* included by Marius Victorinus in his grammar offers more similarities to the definition under scrutiny. Marius Victorinus (2, 9M) defines *oratio* as a *dictio significans* ('a meaningful word') or a *compositio dictionum significantium* ('a combination of meaningful words'). This wording finds a parallel of sorts in the *APS*, where *oratio* is described as *significantibus uocibus*

quae id de quo quaeritur aperte describit et determinat" (192, 21–22B) = Diomedes (*GL* 1: 420, 25–421, 1) ≈ Victorinus (*GL* 6: 188, 25–27) = Audax (*GL* 7: 324, 2–4).

²³ In the case of the *Techne* of Ps.-Dionysius, we refer naturally to *λόγος* and *τοῦ λόγου μέρος*.

²⁴ Cf. Law (1987: 82 n. 47): "Between the definition of *oratio* and its example, two lines from the discussion of *nomina propria* intrude, presumably the result of a misinterpreted *signe de renvoi*." The manuscript M reads: "*oratio est significationibus uocibus secundum rationem ordinata sententia ut puplius cornelius scipio africanus sunt alia sola nomina ut roma appenninus mars omnis homines qui sese student prestare ceteris animalibus summa ope niti decet n.e.v.s.t.u.u.p.*"

²⁵ "The sentence is a meaning composed of signifying words arranged according to reason".

²⁶ Diomedes lists altogether five definitions for *oratio* in his discussion at *GL* 1: 300, 16–22. One of them appears also in the grammars of the Charisius group, one appears also in the grammars of Victorinus and Audax, one of the three shares some features with the definitions quoted by Priscian and Marius Victorinus, and one of the definitions is etymological, "*oratio autem videtur dicta quasi oris ratio, vel a Graeca origine, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀρίζειν ...*" (*GL* 1: 300, 20–21). The first definition that Diomedes quotes is unique to his grammar (*GL* 1: 300, 17): "*Oratio est structura verborum composito exitu ad clausulam terminata.*"

²⁷ Diomedes (*GL* 1: 300, 19–20): "*Scaurus sic, oratio est ore missa et per dictiones ordinata pronuntiatio.*" Cf. the definition occurring in Charisius' grammar (193, 4–5B): "*Oratio est ore missa et per dictiones ordinata pronuntiatio, velut oris ratio.*" This definition appears also in the grammar of Dositheus (14, 2–3Bo) and the *Ars Bobiensis* (1, 2–3D).

²⁸ Cf. Law (1987: 76–77).

²⁹ Victorinus: "*oratio quid est? contextus sermo ad clausulam tendens. unde dicta oratio? quasi oris ratio*" (*GL* 6: 192, 2–3) = Audax (*GL* 7: 324, 8–9). Also Diomedes quotes this definition in his chapter on *oratio* (*GL* 1: 300, 21–22).

(*orditata sententia*) ((‘a sentence arranged) from meaningful words’).³⁰ Diomedes and Priscian also mention the combining or arranging of words as one key element of *oratio*, but they do not describe the words which constitute the sentence as meaningful.³¹

The word *ratio* appearing in the definition of *oratio* in the *APS* also deserves a comment. *Ratio* usually refers to a rational system or rule in grammatical texts (Schad 2007: s.v. *ratio*). Here, however, I feel that reason is meant instead (*secundum rationem ordinata*).³² The definitions of *oratio* (or *λόγος*) do not usually refer to rules or patterns; thus I feel confident in suggesting that *ratio* should be translated as ‘reason’ in this instance.³³

The term *sententia* appears also in several other definitions of *oratio*: such as those preserved in Marius Victorinus’, Diomedes’, and Priscian’s works. In these definitions the term stands for ‘meaning’, not ‘sentence’ or ‘clause’, which are attested in grammatical texts in other contexts (cf. Schad 2007: s.v. *sententia* 2). The same meaning must be assumed for the term *sententia* (‘meaning’) also in the definition of *oratio* in the *APS*, although the example following that definition, a literary quotation (Sall. *Cat.* 1.1), is almost more suggestive of the second interpretation. The choice of the example for *oratio* in the *APS* seems odd when one compares it to, for instance, some of the Greek definitions of *λόγος*.³⁴

The quotation from Sallust’s *Catilina* (1.1) appears in other grammars in addition to the *APS*. Charisius, Diomedes, and Priscian use this passage (albeit in a shorter form) to exemplify forms of the word *omnis*.³⁵ Part of this sentence also appears in Diomedes’ grammar to illustrate expressions containing the dative case (*GL* 1: 313, 11–12).

³⁰ The phrase *significantibus uocibus* refers here to meaningful words, like Marius Victorinus’ *dictionum significantium*. In the definition of *dictio*, the similar phrase *significantium uocum* must refer to ‘meaningful/intelligible sound’ (cf. Schad 2007: s.v. *significans* 2). The author of the *APS* confusingly uses *uox* to refer to both ‘word’ and ‘sound’. Cf. “*Dictio est uox...*” (V, 3) and “*Locutio est uox...*” (VII, 3), where he is clearly referring to a word.

³¹ Diomedes: “*oratio est compositio dictionum consummans sententiam remque perfectam significans*” (*GL* 1: 300, 18–19). Priscian: “*oratio est ordinatio dictionum congrua, sententiam perfectam demonstrans*” (*GL* 2: 53, 28–29). Their stance seems to reflect the view preserved in Diogenes Laertius (7.57), according to which meaning is the preserve of *λόγος* (‘statement’), not *λέξις* (‘word’): “*λέξις δὲ λόγον διαφέρει, ὅτι λόγος ἀεὶ σημαντικός ἐστι, λέξις δὲ καὶ ἄσημος, ὡς ἡ βλίτυρι, λόγος δὲ οὐδαμῶς.*”

³² “Arranged according to reason...”

³³ Cf. the definition of *λόγος* preserved in Diogenes Laertius (7.56), “*...ἀπὸ διανοίας ἐκπεπομένη...*” (‘...issuing from the mind...’).

³⁴ The definition of *λόγος* preserved in Diogenes Laertius (7.56) (see n. 13 above) contains an example (*Ἡμέρα ἐστὶ*). This example is not a literary quotation, as the example appearing in the *APS*, but an example typical of philosophical writings.

³⁵ Charisius 177, 5–6B & 190, 4B, Diomedes *GL* 1: 305, 29, and Priscian *GL* 2: 358, 16.

3.6 De nomine

The author of the *APS* begins his discussion of the eight parts of speech with the noun. This chapter opens with the definition of the noun, followed by the list of its *accidentia*. The essential definition of the noun first states the *genus* to which the part of speech belongs ('the noun is a part of speech...') followed by mixed formal and semantic features.¹ This definition assigns to the noun the capacity of signifying concrete objects or abstract things commonly or properly (*corpus aut rem proprie communiterve significans*). This type of definition is found in most grammars from the fourth century onward,² and it represents the most recent stage of development, which can in all likelihood be traced back to the definition of the noun by Apollonius Dyscolus.³

The late third century grammar of M. Plotius Sacerdos has been transmitted to us in an incomplete state, with most of the chapter on the noun missing, so we cannot know for certain what kind of a definition he used for the noun. The definitions that have been preserved in that grammar all represent the type 'x is a part of speech', that is, the essential definition.⁴ The early fourth-century *Instituta artium* contains a truncated definition of the noun, indicating only the genus of the noun (*pars orationis*). However, the author of the *Instituta artium* clearly had access to the material that other grammarians later incorporated into the definition of the noun, such as material on nouns signifying corporeal or incorporeal things.⁵ In addition to the *APS*, the new definition of the noun is found in some form in the works of Donatus, Charisius, Diomedes, Dositheus, Consentius, Audax,

¹ See, for instance, Donatus (614, 2–3H): "*Nomen est pars orationis cum casu corpus aut rem proprie communiterve significans, proprie, ut Roma Tiberis, communiter, ut urbs flumen.*"

² The definition of the noun found in Augustine's *Ars breuiata* (II, § 1W), "*Nomen est pars orationis cum casu sine tempore significans plene quae aliquo genere quod sexum adinet enuntiantur*", is an essential definition in its form, but signifying gender, not (in)corporeality is assigned as the distinguishing feature of the noun. This is a unique solution, and, according to Luhtala (2005: 139–140), one of the points indicating that the *Ars breuiata* was not influenced by the post-Apollonian renovation in grammar. The definition of the noun in Priscian's *Institutiones* (GL 2: 56, 29–57, 1), "*Nomen est pars orationis, quae unicuique subiectorum corporum, seu rerum communem vel propriam qualitatem distribuit*", preserves the definition of the noun used by Apollonius Dyscolus (GG 1/3, 524, 9–10), and thus Priscian saw no need to repeat the definition used by Donatus, which was essentially a reworking of that same definition (Luhtala 2005: 40). Some grammarians did not begin the chapter on the noun with a definition; this is especially true of the *regulae*-type grammars.

³ According to Di Benedetto (1959: 98–99), the definitions of the noun in the grammars of Diomedes, Charisius, and Donatus are almost literally similar to that occurring in the *Techne*, which is substantially the same as the one put forward by Apollonius Dyscolus.

⁴ Sacerdos' definition of the verb assigns to the verb the capacity of signifying action and undergoing action (GL 6: 429, 15–16), so his definition of the noun might also have shown influence of the post-Apollonian renovation of grammar.

⁵ Cf. GL 4: 51, 21: "*Nomen est scilicet pars orationis*" and GL 4: 119, 21–27: "*Sunt nomina, quae rem corporalem significant, ut puta terra navis mare et cetera talia, quae corpus habere reperiantur. sunt nomina, quae rem incorporalem significant, ut puta pietas iustitia dolor et cetera talia, quae sunt incorporalia, ut grammatici putant. sunt nomina, quae rem proprie communiterve significant, proprie, ut puta Roma Tiberis Diocletianae et cetera talia; communiter, ut puta urbs, flumen thermae, et cetera talia.*"

and the *Ars Bobiensis*.⁶

In addition to the essential definition, many grammarians included one or more other definitions in their discussion of the noun. Etymological definitions of the noun which were attested already in the first century BC⁷ appear in many Late Latin grammars and commentaries.⁸ However, these definitions seem to have a secondary role from the fourth century onward, when discussions on the noun routinely begin with the essential definition, with the less important types of definition following after it (Luhtala 2005: 39; 2010: 232). Diomedes' grammar and Donatus' *Ars maior* contain a tripartite division of the nominal parts of speech following the essential definition of the noun. Diomedes attributes this division to a grammarian called Scaurus (identifiable with the second century AD grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus, not the author of the *APS*). Diomedes quotes a passage from Scaurus where he divides the nominal parts of speech into *nomen* (proper names of individual people and gods), *appellatio* (expressing several similar animate beings), and *vocabulum* (expressing inanimate things).⁹ According to Luhtala (2002: 261), this division represents an earlier stage of Latin grammar, when animateness was considered more important than (in)corporeality in the semantic description of the noun.¹⁰ Donatus echoes the passage quoted by Diomedes in his much briefer formulation (614, 4–5H): “*nomen unius hominis, appellatio multorum, uocabulum rerum est. sed modo nomina generaliter dicimus.*”¹¹ No additional definitions can be found in the *APS*; there is no trace of the tripartite division of the nominal parts of speech, and the author only

⁶ For Donatus' definition see n. 1 above. Charisius (193, 10–13B): “*Nomen est pars orationis cum casu sine tempore rem corporalem aut incorporalem proprie communiterve significans, proprie, ut Roma Tiberis, communiter, ut urbs civitas flumen*”, Diomedes (GL 1: 320, 11–13): “*Nomen quid est? nomen est pars orationis cum casu sine tempore rem corporalem aut incorporalem proprie communiterve significans, proprie, ut Roma Tiberis, communiter, ut urbs flumen*”, Dositheus: “*Nomen est pars orationis cum casu sine tempore rem corporalem <aut incorporalem> significans proprie communiterve: proprie, <ut> Roma, Tiberis; communiter, <ut> civitas, flumen*” (15, 2–5Bo) ≈ *Ars Bobiensis* (1, 8–10D), Consentius (GL 5: 338, 11–14): “*Nomen est pars orationis rem unam aliquam significans. sed ea ipsa quae significantur vel corporalia sunt vel incorporalia. corporalia vel communiter vel proprie significantur, communiter, ut homo mons mare, proprie, ut Cicero Caucasus Hadriaticum*”, Audax (GL 7: 341, 9–10): “*Quid est nomen? nomen est pars orationis cum casu significans rem corporalem, ut homo, seu incorporalem, ut pietas.*” The commentators of Donatus, for instance, Servius (GL 4: 406, 22–23), Sergius (GL 4: 489, 21–22), and Pompey (GL 5: 137, 2–3) also repeat the definition used by Donatus in their works.

⁷ Festus' *De significatu verborum* contains the following etymological definition: “*Nomen dictum quasi novimen, quod notitiam facit*” (179, 13). This text ultimately depends on Verrius Flaccus.

⁸ One etymological definition of the noun can be found in a late second to early third-century papyrus containing fragments of a Latin grammar (P. Lit. Lond. 184): “*nomen est vel-] ut notamen, quo [unam-] quamque rem [vo]cab[ulo] notantes [c]ognos[cimus:] est enim velut not[a quae-] dam rei ...*” (Wouters 1979: 98). Etymological definitions of the noun can be found in the grammars of Diomedes (GL 1: 320, 25–27), Dositheus (15, 5–8Bo), and Priscian (GL 2: 57, 1–4), as well as the *Ars Bobiensis* (1, 10–12D)

⁹ GL 1: 320, 13–24. See p. 13 n. 77, in chapter 1.2. See also Luhtala (2005: 38–39) or (2010: 225–227) for a more detailed analysis of this passage.

¹⁰ See also Cledonius: “*apud veteres haec erat discretio inter nomina et vocabula; nominibus res animales appellabantur, vocabulis res inanimales*” (GL 5: 35, 1–3). Also, Ps.-Probus has a diverging subdivision of common nouns in his treatise (GL 4: 51, 28–29): “*appellatiua autem sunt nomina animalium et inanimalium: sunt item et illa, quae ex aliqua re hominibus accidunt*”.

¹¹ “A name belongs to one person, an appellative to many, a designation to things. But we use only the word ‘nouns’ generally”, (translated by Copeland & Sluiter 2009: 90).

includes an additional etymological definition in the chapter on the participle (cf. XII, 4).

The definition of the noun used in the *APS* is not literally similar to Donatus' definition, although the general content of the definition is much the same: "*Nomen est pars orationis significans rem corporalem aut incorporalem proprie communiterue; proprie, ut Roma, Tiberis, communiter, ut urbs, flumen.*"¹² Instead of Donatus' more philosophical terminology, *corpus/res* ('body'/'thing'),¹³ the author of the *APS* has used the clumsier expressions *res corporalis* and *res incorporalis*.¹⁴ In fact, the variant used in the *APS* (*res corporalis/res incorporalis*) is more prevalent than the variant *corpus/res* in Late Latin grammars.¹⁵ Donatus seems to have been philosophically the most advanced of all the fourth-century grammarians whose writings are preserved to us; his *Ars maior* incorporates all the most important features belonging to the post-Apollonian renovation of grammar (see the discussion in chapter 1.3, p. 27ff.), which none of the other fourth-century grammarians fully incorporate into their works.

The definition of the noun used in the *APS* differs from most other Late Antique Latin ones in that it does not include any formal features, such as *cum casu* or *cum casu sine tempore*.¹⁶ This could be due to a simple scribal error at some stage of the transmission of the text. If leaving out formal features from the definition is a conscious decision on the part of the author, he does not adhere to it consistently. On the contrary, he defines the verb using only formal features (XI, 3).¹⁷

The *accidentia* of the noun number six in this grammar: *qualitas*, *comparatio*, *genus*, *numerus*, *figura*, and *casus*. Both of Donatus' grammars as well as that of Consentius contain a similar list. Comparison is not included in this list in all grammars, as it does not apply to all nouns.¹⁸

Qualitas is discussed first. In Late Latin grammars, nouns were divided into proper and common nouns (*nomina propria/nomina appellatiua*). Echoes of an earlier doctrine in which the

¹² IX, 3–4: "The noun is a part of speech signifying a corporeal or an incorporeal thing as a proper name or as a common name: as a proper name, e.g., Roma, Tiberis, as a common name, e.g., *urbs* (a city), *flumen* (a river)."

¹³ Cf. Luhtala (2010: 234–235).

¹⁴ "A corporeal object/ an incorporeal thing".

¹⁵ Charisius, Diomedes, Dositheus, the *Ars Bobiensis*, the *APS*, Audax, and Consentius all have the variant *res corporalis/res incorporalis* (or *corporalia/incorporalia*). Donatus' *Ars maior* and *Ars minor* have the variant *corpus/res*, as does Priscian (*GL* 2: 56, 29–57, 1). According to Grondeux (2007: 191), the terminology (*corpus/res*) has "a significant parallel with the vocabulary that is to be found in the *Technè* of Dionysius Thrax or in Apollonius Dyscolus", as the "words used at the same places of these *artes* by these grammarians are *soma* and *pragma*."

¹⁶ "With a case/ with a case, but without a tense". Donatus, Diomedes, Charisius, Dositheus, the *Ars Bobiensis*, as well as Audax all add *cum casu* or *cum casu sine tempore* to their definitions. Also Augustine, whose definition differs from the standard one, includes *cum casu sine tempore* in his definition. Priscian, Consentius, and Ps.-Asper ("*nomen est pars orationis qua res quaeque appellatur, siue est animalis, ut homo Cato, siue inanimalis, ut arbor lapis, siue etiam incorporalis, ut perfidia clementia*") do not add formal features to their definitions of the noun.

¹⁷ XI, 3: "*Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu.*"

¹⁸ This argument can be found, e.g., in the commentary of Pompey (*GL* 5: 139, 12–15): "*ergo vides quoniam in eo peccavit, quoniam adnumeravit comparationem, rem non numquam accidentem, inter res semper accidentes. illae enim semper accidunt, qualitas genus numerus figura casus*".

nominal parts of speech were divided in other ways (*nomen/appellatio/uocabulum*) can be found in some Late Antique Latin grammars, but no trace of it can be found in the *APS*.

There are three separate issues that are discussed in the section on proper nouns: firstly, the subdivision of proper nouns into those of gods, men, mountains, cities, and rivers; secondly, the four-fold division of proper names of Roman men; and finally, the issue of names appearing alone or in twos. Proper nouns are defined in this grammar by their ability to contain the properties of the names of gods and people as well as places;¹⁹ following this definition is a list of examples of proper names. This type of list can be found in a few other grammars as well, but the wording here is different from that in any other surviving list.²⁰ Some of the examples appearing here are rather interesting. Firstly, Vivien Law has emended the manuscript reading *sol* to *Apollo*; she regards the manuscript reading as “a gloss interpreted as a correction” at some stage of the transmission (1987: 78 n. 33).²¹ The proper name *Cynthus*,²² which is not attested in the *CGL* database, exemplifies the proper names of mountains alongside the more widely used *Olympus*. Also, *Eridanus*,²³ a poetical name for the river Po, is paired with *Nilus* (‘the Nile’) as an example for the proper names of rivers.

Next, the issue of Roman proper names is briefly discussed.²⁴ The division into four types of names (*praenomen*, *nomen*, *cognomen*, and *agnomen*)²⁵ appears in many discussions, such as Donatus’ *Ars maior*, the grammars of Charisius, Diomedes, and Dositheus, the *Ars Bobiensis*, Priscian’s *Institutiones*, Consentius’ grammar, and also some of the commentaries on Donatus’ works. In Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta artium* this division appears only toward the end of the discussion on the noun, along with other miscellaneous material that had been integrated properly into the

¹⁹ The definition for proper nouns in this grammar is unique (IX, 6–8): “*Propria sunt quae proprietates nominum tam deorum quam hominum quam montium quam urbium quam fluminum continent*”. Also other grammarians include definitions for proper and common nouns in their discussions. For instance, Diomedes has the following definition (*GL I*: 320, 30–31): “*propria sunt quae propriam et circumscriptam qualitatem specialiter significant*”; Dositheus and the *Ars Bobiensis* have a somewhat similar sounding definition: “*propria sunt nomina quae specialiter proprieque dicuntur*” (16, 2–3Bo = 1, 14D). See Luhtala (2005: 45–46) for a discussion on Diomedes’ definition.

²⁰ IX, 8–10: “... *deorum, ut Iuppiter, Apollo, hominum, ut Cato uel Cicero, montium, ut Cynthus, Olympus, urbium, ut Roma, Carthago, fluminum, ut Nilus, Eridanus et huiusmodi alia similia*.” Cf. Diomedes (*GL I*: 320, 30–321,2): “...*item quae unica et sola sunt deorum, ut Iuppiter, et quae bina, ut Liber pater, hominum, ut Romulus, urbium, ut Troia, prouinciarum, ut Africa, insularum, ut Sicilia, montium, ut Pyrenaeus, fluminum, ut Pactolus*”, Dositheus (16, 3–6Bo): “*item quae unica et sola sunt deorum, ut Iuppiter, hominum: Romulus, urbium, ut Roma, prouinciarum, ut Africa, insularum, ut Sicilia, montium: Apenninus, Pyrenaeus, fluminum, ut Pactolus*”, and the *Ars Bobiensis* (1, 14–2, 4D): “*item quae unica et sola sunt deorum, ut Iuppiter Iuno, hominum, ut Romulus Numa, urbium, ut Roma Carthago, prouinciarum, ut Africa Asia, insularum, ut Sicilia Sardinia, montium, ut Appenninus, fluminum, ut Tiberis*.”

²¹ I have accepted her emendation, which is more in line with the rest of the passage. Also, in the light of the attestations of the word *sol* in the *CGL* database, the emendation seems solid enough; most of the attestations of the word *sol* in the database seem to refer to the sun, not the Sun god.

²² The name of this mountain on Delos appears in Latin literature, in, e.g., the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid (2. 221; 6. 204).

²³ The *CGL* database contains seven attestations of the name *Eridanus*, all of which appear in discussions on metrics and pertain to the quotation “*fluuiorum rex Eridanus*” (Verg. g. 1.482).

²⁴ IX, 10–12: “*Diuiduntur autem propria, sed hominum sola, nomina in species quattuor: praenomen, nomen, cognomen, agnomen, ut ‘Puplius Cornelius Scipio Africanus’*.”

²⁵ “A given name, a family name, a surname, and a nick-name.”

framework of most other grammarians' works.²⁶ It is also noteworthy that in the three other grammars containing both this division of Roman proper names and the list of examples of proper names (see n. 20 above), the order of these two elements is the same: the list of different types of proper names comes first followed by the division of Roman proper names. This applies also to the *APS*.

The most common example of the four types of Roman names in Late Latin grammars is Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus.²⁷ There is variation in the form of the name *Publius*, which also appears in some grammars as *Puplius*. In the *APS* the manuscript reads only “*p c*” for *Puplius Cornelius*, but earlier in the manuscript the scribe erroneously inserted the words “*ut puplius cornelius scipio africanus* [sic] *sunt alia sola nomina ut roma appenninus mars*” while still discussing *oratio*. Apparently, when he later copied the name into the section where it actually was supposed to appear, he abbreviated it. From this earlier mistake we can find out that the variant used in this grammar was *Puplius*, like in the works of Charisius and Diomedes, and the *Ars Bobiensis*, not *Publius*, which is the more common variant.

The last issue discussed in the section on proper names is that of the proper names appearing singly and in twos (IX, 12–13): “*Sunt alia sola nomina, ut ‘Roma, Appenninus, Mars, Ceres’, aut bina, ut ‘Iuno Lucina, Liber pater, Venus Verticordia’.*”²⁸ This topic seems to have been little discussed in Late Latin grammars, as no passages with clear links to the section in question can be found in any extant grammar. Diomedes includes a mention on names of gods appearing in twos in his list of types of proper names (*GL* 1: 320, 30): “*item quae unica et sola sunt deorum, ut Iuppiter, et quae bina, ut Liber pater*”. This example (*Liber pater*) appears also in the discussion in the *APS*. Diomedes and Pompey mention names appearing in twos, such as Numa Pompilius and Paris Alexander, also in their discussions of Roman and Greek proper names.²⁹ Although the name *Iuno* is attested nearly 90 times in the *CGL* database, it never appears in conjunction with *Lucina*, the

²⁶ Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 119, 29–31): “*Propria hominum nomina in quattuor species diuiduntur, praenomen nomen cognomen agnomen: praenomen, ut puta Publius, nomen Cornelius, cognomen Scipio, agnomen Africanus*”.

²⁷ This example appears alone or along with other examples in, for example, Donatus’ *Ars maior*, the grammars of Charisius, Consentius, Priscian, Ps.-Probus, Diomedes, and Dositheus, as well as the *Ars Bobiensis*, the grammar of Ps.-Asper, and the *APS*.

²⁸ “Some names appear alone, such as Roma, Appenninus, Mars, and Ceres. Some appear in twos, such as Iuno Lucina, Liber pater, Venus Verticordia.”

²⁹ Diomedes: “*non fere tamen omnia nomina quattuor species admittunt. quaedam enim inveniuntur apud illos unica vel dionyma, ut Palaemon Melicertes, Astyanax Scamandrios, et similiter alia, sicut apud nos Numa Pompilius, Tullus Hostilius, Ancus Marcius, Servius Tullius, Marcus Antonius, Lucius Paulus*” (*GL* 1, 321, 31–322, 3). Pompey: “*propriorum alia praenomina dicuntur, ut Gaius Marcus, alia gentilia, ut Iulius Porcius, alia cognomina, ut Caesar Cato, alia agnomina, ut Numidicus Germanicus. sunt et unica, ut Romulus, et bina, ut Paris Alexander, et quae omnia unius sunt, ut Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus*” (*GL* 5: 549, 26–30).

epithet of the goddess of childbirth.³⁰ *Verticordia* is only attested once in the *CGL* database;³¹ *Venus Verticordia*³² is not attested at all.

Next the author of the *APS* proceeds to discuss common nouns (*nomina appellatiua*). The section on common nouns, which includes both semantic and formal subtypes of common nouns, is intertwined with the discussion on comparison, and some of the semantic subtypes only appear later on, in a passage inserted between the treatment of composition (*figura*) and case (*casus*). The confusion could be due to problems in the transmission of the text – there are a number of textual problems in the passages that follow – or merely reflect the inability of the author to organize his material. According to Luhtala, this type of material – that is, the subtypes of common nouns – was relatively new at this stage; it was integrated into Latin grammar sometime during the third and fourth centuries (2005: 57). Thus it is not surprising that we can find many kinds of solutions in presenting this material in Late Latin grammars. Ps.-Probus does not include any such subtypes in his discussion of *qualitas* (*GL* 4: 51, 23–52, 3), but, instead, some of them appear at the end of his section on the noun under no specific title (*GL* 4: 119, 18ff.). Charisius presents most of the subtypes of common nouns at the end of his discussion on the noun, but he integrates some of the material to the beginning of the section, immediately after the definition of the noun. This material includes the division of Roman proper names into four types and the division of common nouns into those signifying concrete objects and incorporeal things. Only then does Charisius list the properties of the noun and treat the *accidens qualitas* briefly before moving on to discuss the other properties.³³ Dositheus organizes the material in a similar manner. Diomedes, like Donatus, organizes the material under the *accidens qualitas*, discussing a large number of subtypes before moving on to discuss comparison.³⁴ Donatus seems to have the most sophisticated way of organizing the subtypes of common nouns into the discussion on the noun. He places all of the material concerning the subtypes of common nouns together under *qualitas*. The material in itself is heterogeneous, but the decision to group it together has a clear advantage over the aforementioned

³⁰ *Lucina* appears only four times in the *CGL* database: twice when metrical feet are discussed (Victorinus *GL* 6: 207, 25 and Audax *GL* 7: 335, 13) and another two times when words derived from nouns or verbs are listed (Priscian *GL* 2: 78, 18 and Eutyches *GL* 5: 454, 21).

³¹ *Verticordia* appears in Priscian's *Partitiones* (127, 19–21Pa): “*vertigo quoque et vertex a verto verbo fiunt et Vertumnus deus et Verticordia [compositum] dea.*”

³² Unlike *Liber pater* and *Iuno Lucina*, *Venus Verticordia* is very rarely attested in Latin literature. A few instances of this name can, however, be found. Cf., e.g., Valerius Maximus (8.15.12).

³³ Charisius 194, 4–7B: “*nomini accidunt qualitas genus figura numerus casus. qualitas est qua intellegitur proprium sit an appellativum. genera nominum ...*”.

³⁴ For some reason, Diomedes has placed a few of the subtypes to the very end of his section on the noun (*GL* 1: 328, 28–34): “*sunt nomina tota Graecae declinationis, ut Themisto Calypso Pan; sunt tota conversa in Latinam regulam, ut Pollux Πολυδῆκης, Vlixes; sunt inter Graecam Latinamque formam, quae notha appellantur, ut Achilles Agamemnon. sunt praeterea alia sono masculina, intellectu feminina, ut eunuchus comoedia, Orestes tragoedia. satis instructi de nomine transeamus ad pronomen.*”

approaches, which merely add many of the subtypes to the end of the section, with no explanation whatsoever. As mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph, the author of *APS* tries to integrate the material concerning the subtypes of common nouns into his discussion on the properties of the noun, but he is not completely successful in his effort. Nevertheless, his approach is clearly an improvement on those of Ps.-Probus, Charisius, Dositheus, and the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, which merely lump all or most of these subtypes to the end of the section on the noun, with no title or explanation whatsoever.

At the beginning of the section, the author of *APS* divides common nouns into those signifying concrete objects and those signifying incorporeal things.³⁵ This primary division appears also in other grammars,³⁶ whereas in the *Ars maior* of Donatus (*nomina*) *corporalia* and *incorporalia* are just the first two subtypes of common nouns, with many more following. The author of the *APS* then lists four subtypes of common nouns.³⁷ None of the other grammarians discussing the subtypes of common nouns mentions a specific number of subtypes; for instance, Donatus merely states that there are many subtypes of common nouns.³⁸ Often nothing is said about the number of these subtypes, as no title or explanation normally precedes the list of subtypes. The number given in the *APS*, four, agrees with the number of types listed in that passage (*res*, *numerus*, *ordo*, and *gens*),³⁹ but as more subtypes immediately follow in the next passage (IX, 21ff.), the small number makes little sense. The author does, however, give some sort of a justification for grouping these four types together: comparison does not apply to these four subtypes of common nouns.⁴⁰ Thus I have chosen not to emend four to, for example, many.

Of the four types listed by the author, the first one, designating things (*res*), is very peculiar. Whereas the other types (*numerus*, *ordo*, and *gens*) can be found also in other lists of subtypes of common nouns,⁴¹ *res* cannot. Also, having just divided common nouns into two types, those signifying corporeal objects and those signifying incorporeal things (IX, 14–15), listing a subtype that signifies merely ‘things’ in general seems odd.

³⁵ IX, 14–15: “*Appellatiua autem in duas species diuiduntur, quarum alia significat res corporales, ut est ‘homo, terra, mare’, alia incorporales, ut est ‘pietas, iustitia, dignitas’.*”

³⁶ For instance, in the grammars of Charisius, Diomedes, Dositheus, and the *Anonymus Bobiensis*.

³⁷ IX, 15–18: “*Appellatiuorum differentiae sunt quattuor: alia enim rem significant, alia numerum, alia gentem, alia ordinem; rem significant, ut ‘homo, paries’; numerum, ut ‘unus, duo’; ordinem, ut ‘primus, secundus’; gentem, ut ‘Graecus, Hispanus’.*”

³⁸ Donatus, 615, 1H: “*appellatiuorum nominum species multae sunt.*”

³⁹ “Thing, number, order, people.”

⁴⁰ IX, 18–20: “*Horum omnium supra scriptorum nulla recipiunt comparationem, neque enim ‘Graecus’ ‘Graecior’, aut ‘Hispanus’ ‘Hispanior’ potest fieri. Eadem et in ceteris ratio est.*”

⁴¹ For instance, in the *Ars maior* of Donatus, (616, 9–617, 1H), the grammar of Charisius (196, 4–6B), Diomedes’ work (GL 1: 322, 13–15), the grammar of Dositheus (20, 1–3Bo), the *Ars Bobiensis* (4, 26–27D), the grammar of Consentius (GL 5: 340, 1–3), and Ps.-Asper’s work (GL 5: 549, 16–17).

The nouns quoted as examples of common nouns signifying things are *homo* ('a man') and *paries* ('a wall'). *Paries* is actually an emendation of the manuscript reading *partes* ('parts'). *Paries* is attested as an example in also other Late Latin grammars in addition to the *APS*,⁴² and *partes* as a plural form is slightly problematic as an example here; normally the use of plural forms as examples is restricted to exemplifying plural forms or forms that can be interpreted as both singular and plural forms. These examples the author of the *APS* includes lead me to think that *res* ('a thing') means *res corporalis* ('a corporeal object'), not *res incorporalis* ('an abstract thing'). A possible emendation would thus be *rem* <*corporalem*> for *rem*. A similar passage in Charisius, where types of nouns not admitting comparison are listed,⁴³ has the wording *corpus significant* ('signifying a concrete object'). Thus also *corpus* could be a possible emendation here, although mistaking *rem* for *corpus* twice in the same passage would be somewhat difficult to explain as a simple scribal mistake. An emendation of *rem* to *rem* <*corporalem*> or to *corpus* could, perhaps, be justified, but as some confusion in treating this material seems to exist in this grammar and as the material is a relatively recent addition to Latin grammar, one should be careful in correcting the doctrine appearing in the *APS*. The use of this terminology was not yet fully established, and the passage in question may also contain material from different, conflicting sources. Late Antique grammarians were not always very conscientious in updating their terminology or resolving conflicting views expressed in their sources.

Also, further evidence speaking for retaining the reading *rem significant* can be found in the section on the pronoun in this grammar (X, 27). Toward the end of the section on the pronoun the author lists types of pronouns, beginning with the words "*Nam aut rem significant, ut hoc, illud, aut gentem, ut cuias, nostras*" (X, 27ff.).⁴⁴ The category of pronouns signifying things (*res*) can also be found in one other grammar, that of Ps.-Asper.⁴⁵

⁴² *Paries* is attested c. 20 times in the *CGL* database.

⁴³ Charisius 198, 24–28B: "*cetera autem non habent conlationem, velut quae corpus significant, ut homo arbor; vel quae gentes, ut Graecus Hispanus; vel quae numerum, ut unus duo; vel quae ordinem, ut secundus tertius; vel quae ad aliquid referuntur, ut pater frater.*" The use of *corpus* here instead of *res corporalis* is intriguing, as Charisius uses the variant *res corporalis/res incorporalis* in his definition of the noun, not the more sophisticated terms *corpus/res*, which appear in Donatus' definition. But these two passages may not come from the same source, and the use of these terms seems not to have been fully established in most grammars.

⁴⁴ "A pronoun can signify a thing, as in *hoc* (this) and *illud* (that), or a people, as in *cuias* (of what country?) and *nostras* (of our people)".

⁴⁵ *GL* 5: 550, 28–30: "*significatio pronominum in octo partes divisa est: aut enim personam significant, ut quis quae, aut rem, ut hoc istud...*".

The word used by the author of the *APS* to refer to the four aforementioned subtypes is *differentia*. This term can be related to the essential definition,⁴⁶ but it is mostly used in Late Latin grammars in a less philosophical manner, meaning ‘difference’, ‘distinction’, or ‘a different type’ in general (cf. Schad 2007: s.v. *differentia*). The author may have chosen it just to avoid repeating the term *species*, which appears in the previous sentence.⁴⁷ Donatus uses the term *species* for these subtypes, as do his commentators.⁴⁸ Consentius uses the term *differentia* for the subtypes of common nouns, but otherwise there are few similarities between these passages in Consentius and the *APS*.⁴⁹

Next, the author moves on to discuss the relational nouns, the aliorelative nouns, and what we would term adjectives (IX, 21ff.). The passage contains a few textual problems which are difficult to resolve with certainty. Relational nouns imply the existence of another part of speech. Some grammars add no explanation for these nouns, but merely a couple of examples.⁵⁰ Others offer some kind of an explanation, with two main types appearing in Late Latin grammars. For instance, Consentius, Servius, and Pompey put forward an explanation that stresses the fact that something like a son (*filius*) cannot exist without there existing also a father (*pater*) and vice versa.⁵¹ Other grammarians offer a slightly different explanation, which emphasizes the fact that relational nouns need another part of speech to complete their meaning, as does Diomedes (*GL* 1: 322, 27–33): “*sunt quaedam nomina quae per se sine alterius partis orationis adminiculo intellegi non possunt, ut pater frater. recipiunt enim sibi et illa per quae intelleguntur, ut meus tuus. haec a Graecis τὸν πρὸς τί’ appellantur, id est ad aliquid.*”⁵² In the grammar of Ps.-Probus, other nouns are introduced

⁴⁶ Marius Victorinus, *liber de definitionibus*: “oportere nos, posito genere eius rei de qua quaeritur, subiungere species, ut alia quae vicina esse possint discretis communionibus separemus et tandiu interponamus *differentias*, quamdiu ad proprium eius de quo quaeritur signata eius expressione veniamus” (Stangl 1888: 338, 6–10).

⁴⁷ The author of the *APS* uses the term *species* once in the passage on proper nouns (IX, 11) and also in the passage on common nouns (IX, 14).

⁴⁸ Pompey (*GL* 5: 139, 32–34), Servius (*GL* 4: 429, 15), and Sergius (*GL* 5: 535, 34; 536, 20).

⁴⁹ Consentius (*GL* 5: 339, 26–28): “*appellativa autem nomina, quae a genere et specie manare diximus, plures differentias habent. nam vel rem corporalem vel incorporalem significant, ut homo mons flumen pietas iustitia eloquentia...*”.

⁵⁰ E.g., Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 549, 35): “*alia ad aliquid, ut pater mater*” and Donatus, *Ars maior* (617, 3H): “*sunt alia ad aliquid dicta, ut pater, frater*”.

⁵¹ Pompey (*GL* 5: 148, 12–14): “*Sunt alia quae dicuntur ad aliquid, quae ad personam referuntur et per se intellectum non habent, ut si dicas filius; non potest filius esse, nisi patrem habeat; pater non potest esse, nisi filium habeat*”. See also Consentius (*GL* 5: 339, 28–31), “*vel ad aliquid dicuntur, ut pater magister. haec enim alium intellectum secum trahunt: patre enim dicto intellegas simul filium, et magistro dicto intellegas simul discipulum necesse est*”, and Servius (*GL* 4: 430, 19–21). See also the discussion in Schad’s *Lexicon* (2007: s.v. *ad aliquid*).

⁵² “There are nouns which cannot be understood alone without the help of another part of speech, such as ‘father, son’. They are coupled with the words by which they can be understood, such as ‘my, your’. These nouns are called τὸν πρὸς τί’ by the Greeks, that is in relation to something.”

to complete the meaning of relational nouns, but in most grammars possessive pronouns are given as examples, as in Diomedes' work, the *Ars Bobiensis*, and the *Explanationes*, for instance.⁵³

The *APS* aligns itself with this latter group.⁵⁴ The description of relational nouns in the *APS* is, in its essence, the same as that of the so-called Charisius group,⁵⁵ containing a mention that these nouns cannot be (fully) understood on their own,⁵⁶ a Greek as well as a Latin name for these nouns, and the information that relational nouns need to be joined to the words that complete their meaning.⁵⁷ According to Luhtala, relational nouns (*ad aliquid*) have a parallel in Aristotle's categories, for instance, but aliorelative nouns (*ad aliquid qualiter se habentia*) seem to pertain specifically to grammar (2005: 76).⁵⁸

Aliorelative nouns are discussed immediately after relational nouns in the *APS*, as is usual in the Late Latin grammars that contain these two subtypes.⁵⁹ In this passage (IX, 24), there is an omission in the Latin name for this subcategory. The manuscript reading is "*ad aliquid abentia intellectum*"; that reading is not a correct translation of the Greek name of the nouns under question (the Greek name survives in its entirety),⁶⁰ and thus some kind of an emendation is required at this point. Late Latin grammars contain several versions of the name of this subcategory. Donatus, some of his commentators, Consentius, and Cledonius have the version "*(alia) ad aliquid qualiter se habentia*", whereas Charisius, Dositheus, and the *Ars Bobiensis* have "*ad aliquid quodam modo*

⁵³ Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 119, 34–36): "*sunt nomina, quae Graeci τῶν πρὸς τί appellant, id est ad aliquid, ut puta pater frater mater. iunguntur enim quibus respondeant, ut puta pater Marci, mater Iuli, frater Victoris: sic et cetera talia*", the *Ars Bobiensis* (6, 18–21D): "*Sunt quaedam nomina quae per se sine alterius partis orationis adminiculo intellegi non possunt, ut pater frater; recipiunt enim sibi et illa per quae intelleguntur, ut meus tuus: haec a Graecis τῶν πρὸς τί appellantur, id est 'ad aliquid'*", the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (GL 4: 536, 22–26): "*alia ad aliquid dicta, ut pater et frater, avunculus: ... haec sola non habent certam significationem, sed adiectis personis declarantur, ut pater meus, frater tuus.*" In these explanations the relation is said to be explicit (Schad 2007: s.v. *ad aliquid*). Charisius and Dositheus have essentially the same explanation as Diomedes (and the *Ars Bobiensis*), but they do not specify the parts of speech needed to complete the meaning of relational nouns. Cf., e.g., Charisius (198, 2–6B): "*sunt quaedam nomina quae per se sine alterius partis orationis adminiculo intellegi non possunt, quae Graeci dicunt τῶν πρὸς τί, id est ad aliquid, quae non possunt intellegi sola, ut pater mater. iungunt enim sibi et illa per quae intelleguntur.*"

⁵⁴ IX, 21–23: "*Sunt et his similia, quae Graece dicuntur 'τῶν πρὸς τί' dicunt, id est ad aliquid [dicta referuntur], quae per se intellegi sola non possunt, ut 'pater, mater, frater'. Coniungunt enim sibi et illa per quae intellegi possunt, ut 'meus, tuus, noster, uester'.*"

⁵⁵ Diomedes aligns himself in this passage with Charisius, Dositheus, and the *Ars Bobiensis*.

⁵⁶ Although this idea is expressed with a very different wording in the grammars mentioned above ("*...nomina quae per se sine alterius partis orationis adminiculo intellegi non possunt*") and the *APS* ("*...quae per se intellegi sola non possunt*"). Charisius does, however, have also the phrase "*quae non possunt intellegi sola*" in his grammar, which is much closer to the wording of the *APS*.

⁵⁷ Examples for these words are not always included. Cf. the grammars of Charisius and Dositheus (see n. 53)

⁵⁸ According to Swiggers & Wouters (1995: 172), the origin of the aliorelative noun lies in a "mixture of ideas stemming from the Old Academy, Aristotle and the Stoics" combined for grammatical purposes by Dionysius Thrax. However, Luhtala does not think that it was Dionysius Thrax who introduced this term into grammar (2005: 76).

⁵⁹ IX, 23–25: "*Sunt et his similia, quae Graece dicuntur 'τῶν πρὸς τί πῶς ἔχοντα', id est ad aliquid <quodam modo> habentia intellectum, ut dexterior, sinisterior.*"

⁶⁰ IX, 24: "*τῶν πρὸς τί πῶς ἔχοντα*", although the manuscript reading is "ton prosti pro se contra".

attendentia". Finally, Diomedes seems to have combined these two traditions with his "*ad aliquid quodam modo adtendentia vel taliter qualiter se habentia*". Ps.-Probus' account contains the phrase "*ad aliquid quodam modo habentia*", which is closer to the wording of the *APS*. With the help of this passage, I feel more confident in suggesting <*quodam modo*> to complete the lacunose passage in the *APS*.

Another piece of evidence speaking for this emendation is the type of example used with the aliorelative nouns. Donatus, his commentator Servius, Consentius, and Cledonius give *dexter* ('right') and *sinister* ('left') as examples of this type of noun, usually allowing for comparative forms of these words as well.⁶¹ In contrast, Charisius, Dositheus, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, and Ps.-Probus have only the comparative forms as examples of aliorelative nouns.⁶² This seems an odd decision, but probably it reflects the sources used in compiling these grammars. The manuscript containing the *APS* only includes the comparative forms (IX, 24–25), thus strengthening the case for emending the text of the *APS* based on readings found in the second group of texts (of which Ps.-Probus' grammar forms part). Of course, even more of the text of the *APS* could have been lost, including the examples *dexter* and *sinister*, but lacking evidence of such an omission, I leave the conjectures at that.

Next, the author of the *APS* turns to (*nomina*) *mediae potestatis* – that is to say, words that now would be considered adjectives.⁶³ This passage contains no textual problems, and it agrees almost word for word with passages from the grammars of the Charisius group.⁶⁴ The term *mediae potestatis*, referring to words without a complete meaning on their own (that is, adjectives),⁶⁵ only appears in the grammars of the Charisius group, Diomedes' grammar, Ps.-Probus' grammar, and the *APS*. Instead, Donatus, Consentius, and Cledonius refer to these nouns as (*nomina*) *mediae significationis*.⁶⁶ The fact that Late Latin grammars, the *APS* included, divide the discussion of what we understand as adjectives into two or more different subcategories of the noun speak for the

⁶¹ Donatus (617, 3–4H): "*alia ad aliquid qualiter se habentia, ut dexter, sinister: haec et comparativum gradum admittunt, ut dexterior, sinisterior.*"

⁶² Diomedes, who combines two different sources already in naming these nouns, includes both the positive and the comparative forms in his treatment of aliorelative nouns (*GL* 1: 322, 31–33): "... *vel taliter qualiter se habentia, ut dexter sinister. haec et comparativum gradum admittunt, ut dexterior sinisterior.*"

⁶³ IX, 25–27: "*Quaedam mediae potestatis sunt, quae significationem a coniunctis sumunt, ut magnus, fortis. Haec enim per se nullum habent intellectum et ideo <a> quibusdam adiectiones uocantur, ut magnus uir, fortis exercitus.*"

⁶⁴ Cf. Charisius (198, 15–19B): "*quaedam mediae potestatis, quae significationem a coniunctis sumunt, ut magnus fortis. haec enim per se nullum habent intellectum et ideo a quibusdam adiectiones vocantur, ut magnus vir, fortis exercitus.*" See also Dositheus (23, 16–19Bo), the *Ars Bobiensis* (6, 28–7, 3D), and Diomedes (*GL* 1:323, 2–5).

⁶⁵ Cf. Luhtala (2005: 49ff).

⁶⁶ The meaning of the two terms is the same: nouns which have a less than complete meaning on their own. See Schad (2007: s.v. *medius* 3).

relative novelty of this subtype of the noun in the fourth century. This applies also to the fact that there was confusion in the terminology used in describing adjectives.⁶⁷ After listing the *nomina mediae potestatis*, without mentioning that these nouns admit comparison, the author of the *APS* then mentions nouns that undergo comparison as a separate category.⁶⁸ Charisius discusses these two categories together and clearly states that comparison applies to the *nomina mediae potestatis*, giving also the comparative and superlative forms of the words he uses to exemplify the *nomina mediae potestatis*.⁶⁹

Before moving on to discuss the section on comparison in the *APS*, I would like to further comment on the arrangement of the subtypes of common nouns in this grammar. As already mentioned above, there are some problems in the *APS* in integrating this material into the discussion on the noun and also in the internal organization of the subtypes. But as these categories were a relatively new addition into Latin grammar (Luhtala 2005: 49), most grammarians, not just the author of the *APS*, struggled with incorporating this material into their works. After first treating four subtypes of common nouns, the author proceeds to discuss another three subtypes in the following order: (*nomina*) *ad aliquid*, (*nomina*) *ad aliquid quodam modo habentia intellectum*, and (*nomina*) *mediae potestatis*. Unlike the four preceding subtypes, these subtypes are not supplied with any title or explanation. And we might well ask why these three types are discussed together in this order. The discussion above mentioned a passage in Charisius' grammar that lists five subtypes of nouns not admitting comparison, including the (*nomina*) *ad aliquid*.⁷⁰ In the *APS*, the first four subtypes are also characterized as not admitting comparison,⁷¹ so should the (*nomina*) *ad aliquid* (of the type *pater*, *mater*, and *frater*) rather have been discussed with the four types not admitting comparison?

In the lists of semantic and formal subtypes of nouns in Late Latin grammars, the relational nouns (*ad aliquid*) tend to appear immediately before the aliorrelative nouns (*ad aliquid quodam modo attendentia/habentia*). Often the two types are even described as 'similar' (*similia*) to each

⁶⁷ Cf. the discussion on adjectives in Luhtala (2005: 59–62).

⁶⁸ IX, 28–29: “*Conparantur autem ea, quae qualitatem significant, ut pulcher, decens, aut quantitatem, ut magnus, altus.*”

⁶⁹ Charisius (198, 15–21B): “*quaedam mediae potestatis, quae significationem a coniunctis sumunt, ut magnus fortis. haec enim per se nullum habent intellectum et ideo a quibusdam adiectiones vocantur, ut magnus vir, fortis exercitus. his et comparatio accidit, quoniam aut in qualitate sunt aut quantitate, ut magnus maior maximus, fortis fortior fortissimus.*”

⁷⁰ Charisius (198, 24–28B): “*...velut quae corpus significant, ... vel quae gentes, ... vel quae numerum, ... vel quae ordinem, ... vel quae ad aliquid referuntur, ut pater frater.*”

⁷¹ IX, 18–20: “*Horum omnium supra scriptorum nulla recipiunt conparationem, neque enim Graecus Graecior, aut Hispanus Hispanior potest fieri. Eadem et in ceteris ratio est.*”

other.⁷² Only rarely, as in the grammar of Ps.-Asper, is one of the two mentioned without the other.⁷³ The (*nomina*) *mediae potestatis*, are not, however, usually grouped with the relative and aliorelative nouns. An exception to this rule can be found in the rather disjointed list toward the end of the discussion on the noun in the *Instituta artium*, where these three types are presented in the same order as in the *APS*.⁷⁴ Donatus groups (*nomina*) *mediae potestatis* with nouns signifying quality and quantity, and, in the grammars of the Charisius group, they appear at the very end of the list of the subtypes of common nouns, immediately before the discussion on comparison.

Can some rationale be found for grouping these three types together in the *APS*, or are we dealing with a completely random organization of these subtypes? One element connecting all three types is that they all can be said to require another part of speech to complete their meaning.⁷⁵ No reason, however, is stated by the author of the *APS* for presenting the subtypes in this order, nor do the other grammars that group these types together offer any comment upon the subject.⁷⁶ Thus we are left with merely speculation.

Comparison is treated in the *APS* in a long passage from IX, 28 onward. Many issues pertaining to comparison are discussed in the *APS*: for example, the subtypes of common nouns which admit comparison, the grades of comparison, irregular comparative and superlative forms, and atypical use of comparative forms. In this lengthy section there are several problematic passages some of which cannot be resolved in a fully satisfactory manner. The oscillating use of some of the terminology is of interest here as well, as is the fact that the discussion on comparison

⁷² E.g. Charisius (198, 6–8B): “*sunt his similia quae Graeci dicunt τῶν πρὸς τί πως ἔχοντα, id est ad aliquid quodam modo...*”. See also Diomedes (*GL* I: 322, 30–31), the *Ars Bobiensis* (6, 22–23D), Dositheus (23, 6–8Bo), and the *APS* (IX, 23).

⁷³ Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 549, 30–36): “*appellativorum alia animalia dicuntur, ut homo bos, alia inanimalia, ut arbor lapis, alia incorporalia, ut sapientia prudentia; alia gentem significant, ut Gallus Graecus, alia numerum, ut duo tres, alia ordinem, ut secundus tertius; alia sunt primae positionis, ut ager capra, alia derivativa, ut agrarius caprarius, alia diminutiva, ut catulus catellus, alia ad aliquid, ut pater mater, alia qualitatis, ut sapiens doctus, alia quantitatis, ut longus latus.*”

⁷⁴ Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 119, 36–120, 3): “*sunt nomina, quae Graeci τῶν πρὸς τι appellant, id est ad aliquid, ut puta pater frater mater. iunguntur enim quibus respondeant, ut puta pater Marci, mater Iuli, frater Victoris: sic et cetera talia. sunt nomina, quae Graeci τῶν πρὸς τί πως ἔχοντα appellant, id est ad aliquid quodam modo habentia, ut puta dexterior superior inferior. iunguntur enim quibus respondeant, ut puta dexterior oculus, superior dens, inferior uestis: sic et cetera talia. sunt nomina, quae appellantur mediae potestatis siue adiectionis, ut puta fortis magnus uelox. iunguntur enim quibus respondeant, ut puta fortis uir, magnus leo, uelox equus: sic et cetera talia.*”

⁷⁵ Two of the types (the aliorelative nouns and the *nomina mediae potestatis*) are what we would consider adjectives. They are normally combined with nouns to form noun phrases. The relational nouns, although nouns, not adjectives, are nevertheless said to require another part of speech (here a possessive pronoun) to complete their meaning (IX, 21–23): “*... quae per se intellegi sola non possunt, ut ‘pater, mater, frater’. Coniungunt enim sibi et illa per quae intellegi possunt, ut ‘meus, tuus, noster, uester’.*”

⁷⁶ In addition to the aforementioned passages in the *APS* and the *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus, the *Explanations in Donatum* (*GL* 4: 539, 6–11) also group the three subtypes together, albeit in the reverse order (the *nomina mediae significationis*, the aliorelative nouns, the relational nouns): “*de epithetis. <sunt alia> mediae significationis, in medio quasi posita, ut ad quamvis rem possis vertere, ut fortis exercitus, fortis miles [de dextris]. <alia ad aliquid> qualiter se habentia, ut ubi posita fuerint sic dicantur, ut dexterior sinisterior. alia ad aliquid dicta: causa est, propter quam dicantur, quod sanguine aut aliquo necessitudinis vinculo videntur esse devincti, id est ad finitatis propinquitatem.*”

in the *APS* is intertwined with the treatment of the subtypes of common nouns. In this the *APS* differs from many other Late Latin grammars. Donatus (617, 9–619, 6H), for instance, regards comparison as one of the properties of the noun and treats it in its own, independent section, as do also Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 56, 31ff.) and Consentius (*GL* 5: 342, 3–343, 6).⁷⁷ Other grammarians are less clear in their treatment of this subject. For example, Charisius, Dositheus, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, and Diomedes do not consider comparison an *accidens* of the noun. Also, their discussion on this subject seems less coherent; the information on comparison appears in conjunction with the subtypes of common nouns, often after the treatment of the *accidentia* of the noun.⁷⁸ In the *APS*, the account of *comparatio* follows the treatment of relational nouns and what we would call adjectives, and, immediately after the discussion on comparison, more subtypes of common nouns are discussed. The discussions on the properties *qualitas* and *comparatio* are thus intertwined. Only after both discussions have come to an end (at IX, 66), are the four remaining *accidentia* discussed.

On lines 28–31, the author of the *APS* describes the kinds of nouns that admit comparison. According to him, nouns signifying quality or quantity admit comparison, but there are exceptions to this rule.⁷⁹ In this section, no mention is made of the *nomina mediae potestatis* or aliorrelative nouns, discussed immediately before, which also admit comparison.⁸⁰ The first two sentences on lines 28–30 present no problems, but several editorial interventions had to be made to the third sentence in this passage (IX, 30–31) in order to make sense of it. The idea is clear enough: some nouns signifying quality only have one grade of comparison, the positive. This idea appears in many other grammars as well, but it is nowhere expressed with exactly the same wording.⁸¹

The manuscript reading, “*sed quae comparationem recipiunt ceterum mediocris fatuus mortuus et his similia in quantitate sunt sed tamen uno gradu comparantur*”, is problematic in several respects. Firstly, the words *in quantitate* clearly cannot refer to *mediocris* or the other examples, as they signify quality, not quantity. This problem is resolved in the edition by correcting *in quantitate* to *in qualitate* (IX, 31). Also, the manuscript reading *tamen* has been emended to

⁷⁷ Donatus, Consentius, Ps.-Probus, as well as the *APS* list *comparatio* as a property (*accidens*) of the noun; most grammarians do not, as it does not apply to all nouns.

⁷⁸ Charisius includes two sections on comparison in his grammar: an entire chapter entitled *De gradibus comparationis sive conlationis* (144,1–149, 20B) and a shorter discussion in the chapter on the noun (198, 22–200,7B). Also the *Ars Bobiensis* contains two different sections on comparison (7, 4–8, 22D; 37, 19–39, 24D).

⁷⁹ IX, 28–31: “*Comparantur autem ea, quae qualitatem significant, ut ‘pulcher, decens’, aut quantitatem, ut ‘magnus, altus’. Sed non omnia nomina quae in quantitate sunt, aut in qualitate, comparantur. [sed quae comparationem recipiunt] Ceterum ‘mediocris, fatuus, mortuus’ et his similia in qualitate sunt, sed tantum uno gradu comparantur.*”

⁸⁰ These types of nouns could also be understood as signifying quality or quantity, but this is nowhere explicitly stated in the *APS*.

⁸¹ Cf. Charisius (198, 28–30B): “*quaedam nomina quamvis qualitatem significant, gradus tamen collationis non recipiunt, ut mediocris sobrius rudis grandis.*”

tantum to agree with the most likely meaning of the passage ‘admits only one grade of comparison’. The abbreviations of *tantum* and *tamen* are known to have caused confusion to copyists on numerous occasions.⁸² Even after these emendations the passage remains problematic. One solution to improve the text on lines 30–31 would be to reject the passage *sed quae comparationem recipiunt* altogether.⁸³ What remains on lines 30–31, from *ceterum* onward, is now consistent with the rest of the passage. No clear reason, however, can be found for the insertion of the words *sed – recipiunt* on these lines; that is, no sentences with similar wording occur in the vicinity of lines 30–31, although the sequence *nulla recipiunt comparationem* occurs on lines 18–19 and *participia comparationem non recipiunt* on line 61.

The following passage (IX, 32–43) contains the bulk of information on the different grades of comparison. In this passage we can also observe several issues regarding the terminology for comparison and the grades of comparison. In the previous chapter the term *comparatio* is used for comparison. Here, we can find the term *conlatio* appearing three times and a misspelled form, *compatio*, appearing twice. Two emendations for this mistake are possible. Firstly, one can interpret *compatio* as a misspelling of *comparatio* and thus replace the incorrect form with *comparatio*. This interpretation may be correct, but one should note that this particular mistake only appears in this chapter,⁸⁴ something that could be ascribed to chance or to influence from the term *conlatio*. Secondly, it could be that the copyist, perhaps unconsciously expecting to see the more prevalent form *comparatio* in the exemplar, ended up mistakenly writing *compatio* a few times instead of the correct form *conlatio* he should have copied. I have opted for the second explanation, thus emending *compatio* to *conlatio*.

The second issue concerning the terminology occurring in this chapter are the terms for the three grades of comparison. In the first sentence they are named (*gradus*) *positivus*, *comparativus*, and *superlativus*,⁸⁵ but for the rest of the chapter, when several defective adjectives are listed, they are referred to as (*gradus*) *primus*, *secundus*, and *nouissimus*. Adjectives not possessing the normal three grades of comparison are listed in many Late Latin grammars,⁸⁶ but only Charisius’ grammar,

⁸² Cf. Lindsay (1915: s.v. *tamen*, *tantum*).

⁸³ I would like to thank Prof. Mario De Nonno for suggesting this emendation to clarify the disarranged passage.

⁸⁴ This mistake does not occur, for instance, in the list of the *accidentia* (IX, 5) or later on in this chapter, when participles admitting comparison are discussed (IX, 61).

⁸⁵ These are the most common names for the grades of comparison; other names are, however, also attested for the first grade of comparison, as in, e.g., Charisius’ grammar (144, 4–7B): “... *et est primus gradus absolutus, quem et primitivum dixerunt, secundus comparativus, tertius superlativus, et declinantur hoc modo.*”

⁸⁶ See, e.g., Donatus’ *Ars maior* (617, 14ff.H): “*Aliquando enim positivus gradus tantum invenitur, ut mediocris; aliquando positivus et comparativus, ut senex, senior; aliquando positivus et superlativus, ut pius piissimus: nam pro secundo gradu magis adverbium ponimus, ut magis pius; aliquando comparativus et superlativus, ut ulterior ultimus; aliquando superlativus tantum, ut nouissimus.*”

the *Ars Bobiensis*, and the *Excerpta Andecavensia* refer to them with the terms (*gradus*) *primus*, *secundus*, and *tertius*, instead of the more prevalent (*gradus*) *positivus*, *comparativus*, and *superlativus*.⁸⁷ However, no other grammarian uses the term (*gradus*) *novissimus*, as the author of the *APS* does in this passage.⁸⁸

The same three adjectives, *mediocris* ('mediocre'), *fatuus* ('foolish'), and *mortuus* ('dead'), appear as examples twice in two consecutive chapters (IX, 30; 34). This is striking, as only *mediocris* is common in other grammars as an example of adjectives with only one degree of comparison.⁸⁹ If any other examples are included in the treatment of this issue,⁹⁰ they are usually adjectives like *sobrius* ('moderate'), *rudis* ('unpolished'), or *grandis* ('large'). One of the two instances here could be a scribal error, especially considering the garbled state of lines 30–31, but as it is impossible to tell what has happened, both instances have been left untouched in the edited text.

On line 40, toward the end of the section, the copyist of M has mistakenly copied a line that actually appears later in the text, on line 44, "*Sunt multa nomina quae absolutum non habent*".⁹¹ Although the words are out of place on line 40, something similar (i.e., *sunt nomina, sunt multa nomina*) is needed to complete the sentence following the mistakenly copied phrase "...uno [*etiam*] gradu conlationis figurata, quae recipere conlationem possunt [*sobrius*], <si illis> magis et maxime adverbium iungamus, ut magis sobrius et maxime sobrius."⁹² There are, however, also other problems in this sentence, in addition to the missing beginning. The closest parallels to lines 40–43 can be found in the grammars of the Charisius group.⁹³ The passages occurring in these three grammars are very close in both their wording and content to the passage in the *APS*, and they are thus of use in emending the problematic sentence. The confusing manuscript reading *figura* has been emended to *figurata* (IX, 40), reflecting the passive verb form *figurantur* found in the

⁸⁷ Charisius (144, 20–25B): "*Sunt quaedam quae primum et secundum gradum recipiunt tantum modo, ut iuvenis iuvenior <aut> iunior, senex senior; quaedam <quae> secundum et tertium, ut ulterior ultimus, interior intimus; quaedam quae primum et tertium, ut pius piissimus, fidus fidissimus, cuius secunda elatio est magis pius, magis fidus.*" See also the *Ars Bobiensis* (38, 8–13D) and the *Excerpta Andecavensia* (244, 81–84DN): "*Aliquando enim primus tantum gradus invenitur, ut mediocris, singularis; aliquando primus et tertius, ut pius piissimus, aliquando secundus et tertius, ut ulterior ultimus; aliquando tertius tantum, ut novissimus.*"

⁸⁸ Cf. also Schad (2007: s.v. *novissimus*).

⁸⁹ *Mediocris* appears in this context in, e.g., the *Ars maior* of Donatus (618, 1H), Consentius' grammar (*GL* 5: 342, 9), Charisius' grammar (198, 30–31B; 199, 5B), the *Ars Bobiensis* (7, 17D), Dositheus' grammar (25, 8Bo), and the *Explanations* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 539, 25).

⁹⁰ Only the example *mediocris* appears in, e.g., the *Ars maior* of Donatus, Consentius' grammar, and Ps.-Sergius' *Explanations*.

⁹¹ "There are many nouns which do not have the positive degree". The manuscript reading *absolutam uim* has been emended to *absolutum non*.

⁹² "...That admit only one degree of comparison; however, they may undergo comparison if we add the adverbs *magis* and *maxime*, as in *magis sobrius* (more moderate) and *maxime sobrius* (most moderate)."

⁹³ "*Sunt alia absoluta quae nullo quidem gradu collationis figurantur, recipiunt tamen conlationem, si illis magis adverbium iungatur, ut magis rudis, magis pius, et maxime similiter, sicut e contrario minus et minime adduntur*", *Ars Bobiensis* (8, 3–6D) = Dositheus (25, 24–27Bo) ≈ Charisius (199, 18–23B).

grammars of the Charisius group. The first instance of *sobrius* has been deleted from the edited text (IX, 41), as it seems out of place there, appearing, as it does, without any word of introduction (such as *ut*). The word *sobrius* also appears four times (not counting the deleted instance) in the space of a few lines, which would make a scribal mistake all the more likely. The addition of the conjunction *si* is necessary in introducing the dependent clause on lines 41–42. Also necessary is the pronoun *illis* (IX, 41) as a complement for the verb *iungamus*.

Next, the author of the *APS* discusses comparative and superlative forms that lack a corresponding positive form (IX, 44–47).⁹⁴ This passage has parallels in the grammars of the Charisius group as well as the *Excerpta Andecavensia*.⁹⁵ The number of such comparative and superlative forms varies in the aforementioned passages, from two in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* to six in the *Ars Bobiensis*, with no two passages containing exactly the same list of examples. Thus I did not consider it necessary to add, for instance, *citerior* and *citimus*, appearing in the *Ars Bobiensis*, to the text of the *APS*. The only emendation of note in this section is on line 44, where the manuscript reading *absolutam uim* has been emended to *absolutum non*, based on the readings in the parallel passages in the aforementioned grammars (see n. 95).

On lines 48–55, the issue of which cases can be coupled with the comparative and superlative forms is discussed. The same emendation has been made three times in this passage, on lines 48, 49, and 51: the manuscript reading *casu*⁹⁶ *iungitur* was emended to *casui iungitur* based on similar passages in Late Latin grammars (e.g., Diomedes, *GL 1*: 325, 9) and also the dative form in the phrase *casui seruiunt* at XIV, 22.

There is a problematic passage on lines 51–52, in the discussion on the use of the genitive and ablative cases with comparative and superlative forms. The previous, seemingly complete, sentence is followed by the words “*diligenter anim a diuersa loquendi ratione*” in the manuscript. What is more, this reading is the result of several corrections by the scribe. However, an emendation suggested by Professor Mario De Nonno, “*diligenter animaduersa loquendi ratione*”, resolves the problematic manuscript reading.

⁹⁴ IX, 44–47: “*Sunt multa nomina, quae absolutum non habent, sed ex aduerbiis ueniunt, ut ‘ulterior ultimus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘ultra’; ‘inferior infimus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘infra’; ‘prior primus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘prius’; ‘superior supremus’ ab aduerbio, quod est ‘supra’; ‘peior pessimus’ ab eo, quod est ‘peius’.*”

⁹⁵ Cf. “*Sunt item nomina superlativa quae absolutum, id est πρωτότερον, non habent, sed ex adverbio veniunt, ut ulterior ultimus ab ultra adverbio, citerior citimus a citra, inferior infimus ab infra, superior summus a supra, prior etiam et primus ab adverbio prius et peior pessimus ab adverbio peius*”, *Ars Bobiensis* (7, 22–26D) ≈ Charisius (199, 10–14B) and Dositheus (25, 12–17Bo) and “*Sunt nomina conlativa, quae positivos gradus non habent, sed ex adverbiiis ueniunt, ut ulterior ultimus ab adverbio quod est ultra, superior supremus ab adverbio quod est supra*”, *Excerpta Andecavensia* (247, 177–179DN).

⁹⁶ I would like to thank Professor De Nonno for pointing out that the manuscript reading *casu* could be also interpreted as a rare dative form. A fact which could lend support for keeping that reading in the edited text.

As regards grammatical terminology, there is an interesting variant for the term ‘plural’ in this passage. Toward the end of the section this alternative term for plural, *multitudo*, is used twice (IX, 53; 55). Varro uses the term *multitudo* instead of the terms *numerus* (‘grammatical number’) and *pluralis* (‘plural’).⁹⁷ According to Schad (2007: s.v. *multitudo*), there are very few traces of *multitudo* in later grammarians’ works.⁹⁸ The term does not appear elsewhere in the *APS*; for instance, in the section where grammatical number in nouns is discussed only the usual terminology (*singularis/pluralis*) occurs (IX, 77ff.).

Next, the author of the *APS* discusses certain comparative forms that are not used as actual comparatives. This issue is briefly discussed in many grammars and in more depth in the grammars of Priscian and Consentius, for instance.⁹⁹ The closest parallel to the passage in the *APS* (IX, 56–60) can be found in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* (247, 181–188DN), but some differences between the two passages also exist.¹⁰⁰ First of all, in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* the adjectives used as examples of this phenomenon reflect the literary quotations included in the passage. This is not the case with the similar passage in the *APS*, although the author of the *APS* includes in his account the same Virgil quotation that appears also in the *Excerpta Andecavensia*, “*tristior et lac(rimis) o(culos) s(uffusa)*” (*Aen.* 1.228).¹⁰¹ Unlike in the corresponding passage in the *Excerpta Andecavensia*, *tristior* (‘sadder’) was not chosen as an example in the *APS*, but instead *crudior*

⁹⁷ Cf. Schad (2007: s.v. *multitudo*): “*multitudinem, unum an plura significat, ut ‘hic hi, haec <hae>’*” (L. 8.46) and “*Item reprehendunt analogias, quod dicantur multitudinis nomine publicae balneae, non balnea*” (L. 9.68).

⁹⁸ Schad lists one instance in a passage in Charisius’ grammar (64, 16B) and two in the fragment of Donatianus: “*a littera finiuntur Romana nomina et masculina et feminina et neutralia, sed in multitudine, hoc est pluraliter: singularia enim peregrina sunt neutra. masculina, ut Catilina Pansa, feminina, ut amicitia auaritia, communia et masculino et feminino, ut adsecla conuiuia ebria: <conuiuia> feminino Pomponius in auctorato, «postquam conueni omnis conuiuias meas», ebria masculino in eodem Pomponius, «† neque ego sum Memmi neque Cassia neque Munatius Ebria». neutralia in multitudine, hoc est pluraliter, ut Saturnalia Compitalia*” (GL 6: 276, 10–18). These passages in Charisius and Donatianus are almost identical; in Charisius’ work the second instance “*neutralia in multitudine, hoc est pluraliter*” is reduced to “*neutralia pluraliter*” (64, 25B).

⁹⁹ Consentius has more examples in addition to the same example that appears in *APS*, *Aen.* 1.228: “*item comparativus, quamvis recipiat conparationem, saepe minus a positivo significat, ut est «mare Ponticum dulcius quam cetera», id est minus amarum: minus enim est quod dixit dulcius, quam si dixisset dulce: «tristior et lacrimis o(culos) s(uffusa) n(itentis)» id est minus laeta*” (GL 5: 342, 28–32). Priscian has explained the phenomenon more thoroughly: “*est quando pro positivo positus minus eo significat et nulli comparatur, ut: «tristior atque oculos lacrimis suffusa nitentes», tristior enim hic ex parte tristis significat, et: «iam senior, sed cruda deo viridisque senectus»; est quando ad contraria comparatur et minus positivo significat, ut: «mare Ponticum dulcius quam cetera». hic enim non ad dulcia, sed ad amara facta comparatione ostendit, paruum aliquid dulcedinis quam cetera habere Ponticum mare;*” (GL 2: 92, 10–19). Priscian quotes *Aen.* 1.228 once more in his *Institutiones* (GL 3: 192, 17–19): “*et Virgilius Aeneidis I: «tristior et lacrimis oculos suffusa nitentes», tristior pro subtristis.*” This subject is not touched on by the grammars of the Charisius group.

¹⁰⁰ *Excerpta Andecavensia*, 247, 181–188DN: “*Sunt multa nomina quae conlativa videntur in pronuntiatione, sed diminutiva in significatione sunt, ut dulcior tristior; non enim augent significationem, sed magis minuunt. Nam ‘tristior et lacrimis oculos suffusa nitentis’ (Verg. Aen. 1, 228) minus aliquanto quam tristem significat, ut dulcior non magis dulcis, sed paene non dulcis, ut apud Sal<I>ustium ‘† aliqua et ipse† mare Ponticum dulcius quam cetera, nebulosum † quiete brevius’ (hist. frg. 3, 65 M.).*”

¹⁰¹ “Her radiant eyes all dim with tears” (translated by Williams 1910).

(‘cruder’) and *infirmior*¹⁰² (‘weaker’) were chosen. Professor De Nonno thinks that this passage is derived from a fuller treatment and that some part of the account has been lost at some stage. De Nonno also suspects that the odd example *crudior* could be due to some kind of mistake concerning another quotation from Virgil, “*iam senior, sed cruda deo uiridisque senectus*” (*Aen.* 6.304), which occurs in some of the passages where this issue is discussed (see Priscian, n. 99, and Consentius, *GL* 5: 342, 34).

The odd manuscript reading *lacos* on line 60 could be merely a corrupted form of *lacrimis*, but it could also plausibly stand for an abbreviation for a slightly longer passage from Virgil (*Aen.* 1.228). The reading *lacos* could be interpreted as *lac(rimis) o(culos) s(uffusa)*.¹⁰³ Earlier in the grammar there is a quotation from Sallust (*Cat.* 1.1), which has been partly abbreviated using only the first letter of each word: “*omnis homines, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus summa ope niti decet, ne u(itam) s(ilentio) t(ranseant) u(el)u(n) p(ecora)*.” The abbreviation is, however, partly incorrect; at some stage a scribe has written *n. e.* when he should have written the conjunction *ne*. This kind of abbreviation seems particularly prone to omissions or misinterpretations, especially when a long list of letters, meaningless *per se*, is copied. The scribes probably did not always know the quotations in question well or perhaps did not know them at all.

The last issue concerning the comparison of adjectives is a brief mention on participles not admitting comparison.¹⁰⁴ This issue is more often discussed in the chapter on the participle, but some grammarians mention it in their discussion on the comparison of nouns.¹⁰⁵ The examples illustrating this point (*cultus*, *uisus*) seem out of place here, however, as does the mention about their genitive forms. *Cultus* and *uisus* (usually along with *passus*) are often given in Late Latin

¹⁰² Quintilian refers to the relatively common practice of using the comparative forms (of an adjective) in place of the positive forms (*Inst.* 9.3.19): “*utimur vulgo et comparativis pro absolutis, ut cum se quis infirmiore esse dicet*”. *Infirmior* is the example Quintilian gives for this phenomenon. I would like to thank Prof. Mario De Nonno for pointing out this passage to me.

¹⁰³ Consentius (*GL* 5: 342, 31–32) has abbreviated this same verse in a similar way: “*tristior et lacrimis o. s. n.*”

¹⁰⁴ IX, 61–63: “*Participia comparationem non recipiunt, et ideo pleraque participia <quando> comparantur, fiunt nomina, ut ꝑcultus, uisusꝑ. [sed participia huius culti huius uisu faciunt genetiuo singulari porro cum sint nomina huius cultus huius uisus faciuntꝑ]*”.

¹⁰⁵ For example, the following grammars treat this issue in the section on the participle: Donatus, *Ars maior* (*de participio*, 646, 9–10H): “*sunt participia, quae accepta comparatione fiunt nomina, ut acceptus incensus, acceptior incensior*”, Pompey (*de participio*, *GL* 5: 263, 36–264, 2): “*sunt aliqua participia, quae tam diu sunt participia, quam diu non recipiunt comparationem; cum receperint, fiunt nomina*”, Servius (*GL* 4: 441, 21–24), Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 142, 15–21), Priscian (*GL* 2: 568, 30–569, 1). Some grammarians do, however, briefly discuss this point in the section on the comparison of the noun, as, for instance, the *Explanaciones* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 539, 34–35): “*verba et participia comparationem non recipiunt: nam si receperint, nomina sunt*”, Priscian (*GL* 2: 84, 21–22): “*a participiis: indulgens indulgentior, amans amantior. sed quando comparantur participia, transeunt in nomen significationem*” and some of the grammars of the Charisius group (*Ars Bobiensis* 38, 20–21D): “*Observabimus tamen, quod ipsum iam adnotavimus, nomina in comparationibus versari tantum, non participia*”.

grammars as examples of past participles that can be confused with homonymous nouns.¹⁰⁶ Whether judged nouns or participles, they do not admit comparison. As the section on lines 62–63, from the word *cultus* onward, already appears almost word for word in the section on the participle (XII, 20–21), it has been deleted at this point. *Cultus* and *uisus* have at some stage of the transmission of the text replaced the correct examples that once illustrated the discussion on participles that should be considered nouns, if they admit comparison.¹⁰⁷

Having discussed the comparison of nouns at length, the author of the *APS* turns once more to the subtypes of common nouns (IX, 64–66).¹⁰⁸ He first lists nouns indicating genera and species (*nomina generalia*, *nomina specialia*), giving no definition for either of these subtypes, merely two examples each (*animal*, *corpus* and *homo*, *lapis*). In giving no further clarification to these subcategories the author of the *APS* is for once closer in his approach to Donatus' *Ars maior* than the grammars of the Charisius group.¹⁰⁹

Next, the author briefly discusses the basic forms of nouns and the forms achieved by diminution and derivation (*nomina primae positionis/diminutiua/deriuatiua*). The only additional information, excluding the examples quoted for each subtype, is the inclusion of the Greek name for diminution (κατὰ ὑποκορισμὸν) in the discussion. Otherwise the treatment of the subject is very sparse, even when compared with Donatus' account.¹¹⁰ Unlike, for example, Donatus and author of the *APS*, who treat diminutives as a subcategory of common nouns, Priscian treats them in the section on derivation, as do also Diomedes and Ps.-Probus (cf. Schad 2007: s.v. *diminutivus* 2).¹¹¹ Some of the examples used by the author of the *APS* (*capella*, *capellarius*) are not used

¹⁰⁶ See, for instance, the *Ars maior* of Donatus (646, 5–6H): “*sunt multa participia eadem et nomina, ut passus, uisus, cultus, quae tamen et in casibus discrepant et de temporibus dinoscuntur.*” Cf. also Charisius (232, 24–29B) and Diomedes (GL 1: 402, 25–29) with XII, 20–21 in the *APS*: “*Sunt quaedam participia eadem et nomina, ut ‘cultus, uisus’, sed participia ‘huius culti, huius uisi’ faciunt genetiuo singulari, cum sunt nomina ‘huius cultus, huius uisus’ faciunt.*”

¹⁰⁷ Cf. the examples given in a similar discussion in Donatus' *Ars maior* (646, 9–10H) in n. 105 above: “*acceptus incensus, acceptor incensor.*”

¹⁰⁸ IX, 64–66: “*Item nomina alia sunt generalia, ut ‘animal, corpus’; alia specialia, ut ‘homo, lapis’.* Item alia primae positionis, ut ‘mons, capra’; alia diminutiua κατὰ ὑποκορισμὸν, ut ‘monticulus, capella’; alia deriuatiua, ut ‘montanus, caprarius, monticularius, capellarius’.”

¹⁰⁹ Charisius (197, 14–18B): “*quaedam generalia sunt quibus multa continentur dissimilia, ut animal arbor. ex his nascuntur specialia quae tamen insunt originibus suis generlibus, velut homo equus taurus laurus pinus fraxinus.*” Donatus, as usual, is very brief in treating these subtypes (617, 5H): “*sunt alia generalia, ut corpus, animal; alia specialia, ut lapis homo lignum.*” Donatus and Consentius (GL 5: 341, 22–25) have the same examples as the *APS*: “*...quod plerique grammatici eius modi diuisionem fecerunt, ut alia generalia nomina dicerent, ut corpus animal, alia specialia, ut lapis homo, alia propria, ut Cicero.*”

¹¹⁰ Donatus (615, 3–6H): “*alia sunt primae positionis, ut mons, schola; alia deriuatiua, ut montanus, scholasticus; alia diminutiua, ut monticulus, scholasticulus. diminutiuorum tres sunt gradus; quorum forma quam magis minuitur, crescit saepe numerus syllabarum. sunt etiam quasi diminutiua, quorum origo non cernitur, ut fabula, macula, tabula, uinculum.*”

¹¹¹ Diomedes' discussion on derivation includes a discussion on comparison after which he resumes his discussion on diminutives.

elsewhere,¹¹² whereas forms derived from the noun *mons* frequently occur in Late Latin grammars.

After this short section on the subtypes of common nouns, the author of the *APS* turns to the *accidens genus* ('grammatical gender') (IX, 67–76).¹¹³ He begins with a definition of the term *genus* (IX, 67): "*Genus est origo nascendi*" ('*Genus* is the source of generation'). This definition is not known from any other Late Latin grammar. In this definition the term *genus* most likely refers to the original meaning of *genus* as 'birth', not 'grammatical gender'. The primary meaning of the term *genus* was also referred to by the Late Latin grammarians in a number of other passages.¹¹⁴

The author of the *APS* gives the number of grammatical genders as three, although he then discusses also nouns of the common gender as well as those of the epicene gender. Varro identified three genders in his *De lingua Latina* (9.57), and also many later grammarians considered the first three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter) as the primary genders; see, for instance, Diomedes' account (*GL* 1: 301, 4): "*genera nominum sunt principalia tria, masculinum femininum neutrum.*"¹¹⁵ Diomedes then proceeds to add a fourth gender, the common gender, and a fifth, the epicene gender.¹¹⁶ This is also Charisius' approach (15, 11–20B and 194, 7–23B). Donatus, however, gives the number of genders as four in his discussion on gender in both the *Ars maior* and the *Ars minor*, adding to the three primary genders the nouns common to two genders.¹¹⁷ Ps.-Probus and the *Ars Bobiensis* list five genders: "*Genera nominum sunt quinque: masculinum femininum neutrum commune omne*" (*GL* 4: 52, 5–6 = 2, 25–26D).¹¹⁸ The *Ars Bobiensis* adds the epicene gender immediately after discussing the five aforementioned grammatical genders,¹¹⁹ whereas Ps.-

¹¹² *Capra* and *caprarius* can be found in Ps.-Asper's account (*GL* 5: 549, 33–34).

¹¹³ IX, 67–76: "*Genus est origo nascendi. Sunt autem genera nominum tria: masculinum, femininum, neutrum. Masculinum genus est cui numero singulari nominatio casu pronomen praeponimus hic, ut hic miles. Femininum est cui pronomen praeponimus haec, ut haec mulier. Neutrum est cui pronomen praeponimus hoc, ut hoc negotium. Ex his commune fit duobus modis: sunt autem communia aut ex genere masculino et feminino, ut hic et haec canis; aut ex feminino singulari et neutro plurali, ut haec magna – dicimus enim haec magna mulier et haec magna mancipia – aut ex omnibus tribus, ut hic et haec et hoc felix. Sunt promiscua nomina quae Graeci epicoena appellant, ut passer, aquila. Haec enim sub uno genere duorum habent intellectum; nam et passerem feminam accipimus et aquilam masculino quoque genere intellegimus, quamvis feminino tantum genere dicatur.*"

¹¹⁴ See, for instance, Consentius (*GL* 5: 343, 7–10): "*genera nominum, quae naturalia sunt, duo sunt, ut quidam uolunt, masculinum et femininum, quoniam omne scilicet animal natura necesse est esse aut masculinum aut femininum. dicta autem haec sunt ab eo genera, quod generare possunt.*" See also Pompey (*GL* 5: 159, 23ff.) and Servius (*GL* 4: 407, 39ff.).

¹¹⁵ "There are three main types of grammatical gender in nouns: masculine, feminine, neuter." See also Consentius (*GL* 5: 343, 28–30).

¹¹⁶ *GL* 1: 301, 8–13: "*Ex his quartum genus commune nascitur, quod fit duobus modis. ... est et quintum genus, quod Graece epicoenon dicitur.*"

¹¹⁷ Donatus (586, 5ff.H = 619, 7ff.H): "*Genera nominum quot sunt? quattuor. quae? masculinum, ut hic magister, femininum, ut haec musa, neutrum, ut hoc scammum, commune ut hic et haec sacerdos.*"

¹¹⁸ "There are five types of grammatical gender in nouns: masculine, feminine, neuter, common to two genders, common to three genders."

¹¹⁹ 3, 1–4D: "*Sunt et promiscua nomina, quae Graeci ἐπίκοινα vocant, cum quod necessarie masculino genere pronuntiatur etiam femininum intellegitur, vel contra quod feminine pronuntiatur etiam masculino accipitur, ut passer aquila.*"

Probus only includes the information on the epicene gender at the very end of the chapter on the noun, along with other miscellaneous material.¹²⁰

The common gender (*genus commune*) can refer to either nouns common to two genders (the masculine and feminine genders, such as *hic et haec sacerdos*) or nouns common to three genders (of the type *hic et haec et hoc felix*). Sometimes this latter type is called (*genus*) *omne*, as, for instance, in the grammars of Donatus, Ps.-Probus, and the *Anonymus Bobiensis*. The *APS* follows the more typical system in naming nouns common to both two and three genders as *communia*.¹²¹ There is, however, something rather atypical in how the *APS* describes nouns common to two genders. Most grammarians give only one kind of example, namely for the masculine and feminine nominative singular forms, like Diomedes (*GL 1*: 301, 9–11): “*sunt enim communia duum generum ex masculino et feminino, ut hic et haec homo et hic et haec sacerdos*”.¹²² The *APS* gives first a more typical example of common nouns, followed by another, much rarer example: “*sunt autem communia aut ex genere masculino et feminino, ut hic et haec canis, aut ex feminino singulari et neutro plurali, ut haec magna – dicimus enim haec magna mulier et haec magna mancipia*”.¹²³ Whereas the author of the *APS* accepts word forms capable of acting as both singular and plural nominative forms as instances of nouns common to two genders, Ps.-Probus takes this approach much further; he accepts all case forms that can be used with nouns of two different genders.¹²⁴ This includes accusative singular forms, like *felicem* (‘happy’), which can be combined with a masculine noun, e.g., *felicem puerum* (‘happy boy’), or a feminine noun, e.g., *felicem puellam* (‘happy girl’), and genitive plural forms, such as *magnorum*, which appears in the declension of both masculines and neuters: “*magnorum puerorum, magnorum mancipiorum*” (‘great boys’, ‘great servants’). Ps.-Probus also includes an example similar to the one appearing in the *APS*: “*...ut puta magna alta et*

¹²⁰ *GL 4*: 120, 3–6: “*sunt nomina, quae Graeci epicoena appellant, id est promiscua, siquidem ex suo genere et aliam speciem designant, ut puta canis simia sus passer bos aquila belua et cetera talia.*”

¹²¹ This approach is attested in already Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.4.23): “*... non erit contentus tradere in nominibus tria genera et quae sunt duobus omnibusve communia.*”

¹²² “There are nouns that are common to two genders, masculine and feminine, such as this person (m.) and this person (f.) or this priest and this priestess.” See also, e.g., Donatus (see n. 117 above), Consentius (*GL 5*: 344, 20–22), Charisius (15, 13–14B) and (194, 15–16B), and the *Ars Bobiensis* (2, 29–30D).

¹²³ “There are nouns that are common to the masculine and feminine gender, such as this dog (m.) and this dog (f.), or nouns that are common to the feminine singular and the neuter plural, such as this/these great (because we can say this great woman and these great servants).”

¹²⁴ *GL 4*: 52, 10–20: “*commune genus est, quod duobus generibus convenit tantum, ut puta masculino et feminino tales felicem et cetera talia: dicimus enim tales pueros et tales puellas, felicem puerum et felicem puellam. item quod masculino et neutro convenit tantum, ut puta magnorum doctorum et cetera talia: dicimus enim magnorum puerorum et magnorum mancipiorum, doctum puerum et doctum mancipium. item quod feminino et neutro convenit tantum, ut puta magna alta et cetera talia: dicimus enim magna mulier et magna mancipia, alta domus et alta templa. sic et cetera talia, quae in quocumque casu duobus generibus convenire reperiuntur tantum, haec communis generis esse pronuntiantur.*”

cetera talia: dicimus enim magna mulier et magna mancipia, alta domus et alta templa.”¹²⁵

However, the accounts of gender in the *APS* and the grammar of Ps.-Probus differ greatly, and no direct link between these two passages can be posited.

The author of the *APS* then moves on to discuss grammatical number (*numerus*). He states that there are two types of grammatical number, the singular and the plural, but immediately afterward he informs us that also nouns common to both numbers exist. This is not unusual in Late Latin grammars; only Ps.-Probus states that there are three types of grammatical number at the very beginning of his discussion on *numerus*,¹²⁶ but many grammarians add this information at some point in their discussion.¹²⁷ The emendation of the ablative *utroque numero* to the genitive form *utriusque numeri* was necessary, as otherwise the ablative would have had to be further augmented for the passage to make proper sense.

Next, the author lists nouns appearing only in the singular or plural or having a singular form and a plural meaning or vice versa (IX, 78–82). Most of the examples quoted here appear many times in a similar capacity in other Late Latin grammars, but a few are attested only rarely, perhaps just once in addition to the passage here. *Garum* (‘fish-sauce’), for instance, is only attested twice (in Charisius’ work, at 38, 25B and 118, 15B), appearing both times in similar, though longer, passages on nouns found only in the singular or plural form. Also *sabbata* (‘the Sabbath’) appears only twice in the corpus of Latin grammarians, once in a non-related passage in Priscian’s *Institutiones* and once exemplifying nouns appearing only in the plural in the *Appendix* of Ps.-Probus.¹²⁸ These instances of similar examples are no basis for arguing for a close relationship between the *APS* and the aforementioned texts. Material containing lists of *nomina semper pluralia* and *nomina semper singularia*, for instance, would have circulated in many forms in Late Antiquity, and the author of the *APS* or his source could have had at his disposal a list that has not survived. The author of the *APS* could also have compiled these lists of examples from several

¹²⁵ “Such as great, high, and others like it: because we can say great woman or great servants and high building or high temples.”

¹²⁶ *GL* 4: 74, 22: “*numeri nominum sunt tres, singularis pluralis et communis*”. Ps.-Probus consistently includes the common number in the chapters on number in nouns, pronouns, verbs, and participles.

¹²⁷ See for instance Dositheus: “*Quaedam singularem pluralemque numerum communiter significant, ut dies, nubes*” (17, 25–27Bo ≈ *Ars Bobiensis* 3, 12–13D), Donatus (623, 1H): “*Sunt etiam numero communia, ut res, nubes, dies*”, Consentius (*GL* 5: 348, 15–18): “*sunt etiam quaedam nomina utriusque numeri communia, ut res nubes dies: nam et hic dies et hi dies, haec res et hae res, haec nubes et hae nubes nominatiuo et uocatiuo casu tam singulari quam plurali similiter efferuntur*”, Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 550, 3–4): “*numeri accidunt duo, singularis, ut hic Cato, pluralis, ut hi Catones, communis, ut dies nubes*”.

¹²⁸ *GL* 4: 196, 2–3: “*nomina generis neutri semper pluralis numeri: arma is, bucolica is, moenia bus, mapalia bus, sabbata is...*”.

sources. For instance, the examples for nouns always appearing in the plural¹²⁹ begin with the nouns *sordes* (f.) and *moenia* (n.) ('mourning', 'city walls'), two examples which appear also in the grammars of the Charisius group.¹³⁰ The examples that follow these two are presented in the following order: two examples of masculine nouns that always appear in the plural, three feminine nouns, and four neuter ones. This could suggest that the list of examples in the *APS* could have been compiled from a source with longer lists of such nouns, perhaps divided according to gender (cf. Diomedes *GL 1*: 327, 16ff.).

Finally, the issue of dual number is commented upon in the passage on *numerus*. The sentence on lines 82–84 appears almost word for word in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL 4*: 540, 6–8): "*Sunt quaedam quae neque singulari neque plurali numero recte adiungi possunt, et ideo duali adsignanda sunt, ut duo, ambo, uterque, neuter.*" The only divergence of note between the passages is the reading *uter* ('which (of the two)?') instead of *uterque* found in the *APS*. I think that *uter* is the weaker reading in this context; the reading *uterque* ('both') is more in line with the other examples for the dual number.

Other grammarians who discuss the dual number, Donatus, Consentius, and Pompey, for instance, accept its existence for words like *duo* and *ambo*.¹³¹ But Diomedes (*GL 1*: 301, 21–22) and Charisius (195, 2B) speak against the existence of the dual number in Latin, restricting its use to the Greek language.¹³² They offer no explanation, however, to forms such as *duo* and *ambo*, which clearly differ from the normal patterns of Latin noun inflection.

The discussion on composition (*figura*) (IX, 85–89) merits little comment. The discussion is very brief, with merely a mention of the two types of composition, simple and compound, along with two examples (*felix, infelix*; 'happy', 'unhappy'). The discussion on the ways nouns can be compounded is similar to many other discussions occurring in Late Latin grammars, and all of the examples quoted in the *APS* can be found in also other grammarians' works. For instance, Donatus'

¹²⁹ IX, 79–80: "*sunt semper pluralia, ut sordes, moenia, cancelli, loculi, scalae, quadrigae, scopae, arma, castra, exta, sabbata*".

¹³⁰ Dositheus (17, 24–25Bo) = *Ars Bobiensis* (3, 11D): "*sunt autem quaedam nomina semper pluralia, ut sordes moenia*".

¹³¹ Donatus (622, 11–12H): "*Est et dualis numerus, qui singulariter enuntiari non potest, ut hi ambo, hi duo.*" Consentius (*GL 5*: 347, 22–348, 1): "*quamvis quidam etiam dualem dixerint, qui duo et ambo [uterque], quoniam neque singularis neque pluralis numeri dicere possumus, dualis esse <dixerunt>.*" Donatus' examples *duo* and *ambo* suggest themselves both in terms of their meaning and in terms of their diverging inflection, but it is interesting that Consentius has included also *uterque* in his discussion. The inclusion of *uterque* is understandable when we consider its meaning, but the inflection of *uterque* is more reminiscent of that of pronouns, not duals like *duo* or *ambo*. Although the editor, H. Keil, has rejected *uterque*, the fact that it appears also in, e.g., the *APS*, may suggest that the manuscript reading should be accepted.

¹³² Also Ps.-Sergius (*GL 4*: 494, 31ff.) and Priscian (*GL 2*: 172, 3ff.) speak against the existence of the dual number in Latin.

grammars contain the examples *suburbanus*, *ineptus*, *insulsus*, *inexpugnabilis*, and *inperterritus*, and the grammars of the Charisius group include the examples *opifex*, *artifex*, and *omnipotens*. Also, the changes made to the text on these lines are few and rather straightforward in their nature.

After discussing composition the author finally proceeds to discuss the last subtypes of common nouns, along with types of proper nouns and adjectives derived from proper nouns (IX, 90–97). The passage seems out of place between the treatment of composition (*figura*) and case (*casus*). Furthermore, the fact that subtypes of common nouns (e.g., homonyms and synonyms) are discussed along with types of proper nouns seems odd. Clearly, the integration of these subtypes into the discussion on the noun presented problems for the author of the *APS*. The passage contains also a number of textual problems. A similar passage has been preserved in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius, which helps in trying to restore the correct readings here.¹³³ However, it is interesting to see that the compiler of the *Explanationes* has left out the homonyms and the synonyms in adapting this passage for his commentary, preferring to discuss only the subtypes related to proper nouns. This omission could be due to mistakes in the transmission of the text, but this seems too convenient to be very likely. The *Explanationes* does discuss homonyms and synonyms, but this is done in an earlier section of the chapter and relying on a different source (cf. *GL* 4: 537, 27–538, 4).

The manuscript reading *naturaliter* on line 90 has been rejected, as it most likely stems from contamination with an instance of the word appearing a few lines down. As further proof, the text of the *Explanationes* only contains the latter instance of *naturaliter*. The manuscript reading *patronomica* (IX, 90), which is repeated in the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 539, 36), has been emended to *patronymica*. The form *patronomica* is not attested in any other Late Latin grammar, unlike the form *patronymica* (cf. Schad 2007: s.v. *patronymicus*).

On line 90 there is also a problematic reading, *equidem*, preceding the verb *deducuntur*. This reading appears also in the manuscript containing the *Explanationes* and has been emended to *quae* by Keil (*GL* 4: 540, 1). The conjunction *equidem* rarely appears with other persons than the first, so an emendation seems to be required here. But rather than accept Keil's emendation, I prefer the one suggested by Mario De Nonno, namely *et ea quidem*. The next sentence (IX, 92–93), “*sed et illa quae naturaliter intelleguntur quorum aut patrymones ut ad Scipiadas duos bello id est Scipiones*”, has been preserved in a confusing state as well. The *Explanationes* contains the following version (*GL* 4: 540, 2–3): “*sed et illa quae naturaliter intelleguntur, ut ‘Scipiadas duos bello’, id est*

¹³³ *GL* 4: 539, 36–540,6: “*Sunt quae a Graecis patronomica, a nobis patria dicuntur, ut Atrides Pelides. quae deducuntur apud Homerum a patre et ab avo et retro, apud Lycophronem et ab uxore; sed et illa quae naturaliter intelleguntur, ut ‘Scipiadas duos bello’, id est Scipiones. dionymon, ut Paris Alexander, Elissa Dido. est etiam quod dicunt feronymon, ut Pasiphae Hippolytus, a solis scilicet splendore et equo; aut eponymon, ut Dardanio Anchisae.*”

Scipiones.” Although the reading *sed* is corroborated by the *Explanationes*, I am inclined to emend it to *sunt*, as the adversative meaning of the conjunction *sed* seems superfluous here. The puzzling manuscript reading *quorum aut patrymones* has no parallel in the *Explanationes*; this would speak for rejecting it altogether, which indeed I have done. The word *quorum* is repeated many times from IX, 108 onward, which could help to explain its intrusion here.

Next in the discussion comes the category of *dionymon* (‘a double name’) on line 93. Similar use of the term is, according to Schad (2007: s.v. *dionyma*), only found in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 540, 3). However, the term is used by Diomedes and Priscian in a slightly different way, that is, to denote Roman names with two elements, like Numa Pompilius.¹³⁴ The usage found in the *APS* (and the *Explanationes*) is closer to the original Greek use of this term.¹³⁵

After discussing nouns related to proper names the author of the *APS* turns to the remaining two subcategories of the common noun, namely homonyms and synonyms (IX, 94ff.). These two categories are not labelled as subtypes of common nouns; they follow *dionymon*, a type of proper name, and they are not distinguished in any way from the other types of nouns discussed in this passage. It is possible that these lines have been mistakenly copied here. In the grammars of the Charisius group and in Diomedes’ grammar, homonyms and synonyms are discussed after the aliorelative and relational nouns, preceding the *nomina mediae potestatis*. Donatus and Consentius do, however, discuss these subtypes immediately before discussing patronymics and possessives (of the type *Atrides*, *Evandrius*). The doctrine on homonyms and synonyms in the *APS* is similar to that occurring in most other Late Latin grammars, as are the examples quoted.¹³⁶ These two subcategories of common nouns seem to be rather well-established; most grammarians have no problem in integrating them into their discussions. The *APS* and the *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus belong to the minority in the fourth century in struggling with this material. Ps.-Probus once again adds the information he fails to integrate properly into his discussion on the noun toward the end of his account.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ See Diomedes (*GL* 1: 322, 1–3), who includes this category into his discussion on proper names. See also Priscian (*GL* 2: 61, 1ff.).

¹³⁵ Cf., e.g., Ps.-Dionysius Thrax.

¹³⁶ Cf., e.g., Donatus (615, 10–11H): “*sunt alia homonyma, quae una appellatione plura significant, ut nepos, acies, aries; sunt alia synonyma uel polyonoma, ut terra humus tellus, ensis mucro gladius.*”

¹³⁷ *GL* 4: 120, 6–17: “*sunt nomina, quae appellantur synonyma, hoc est quae variis significationibus unam rem designant, ut puta tellus terra humus et cetera talia, item alvus venter uterus et cetera talia, item gladius ensis mucro telum et cetera talia, item scutum clipeus parma umbo et cetera talia, item mare pontus aequor et cetera talia. sunt nomina, quae appellantur homonyma, hoc est quae una significatione varias res designant, ut puta nepos foedus scortum agmen aries et cetera talia. nepos enim modo tertiam progeniem hominum, modo luxuriosum designat; item foedus modo turpem, modo iusiurandum significat; item scortum modo corium, modo meretricem demonstrat; item agmen modo multitudinem modo iter significat; aries vero modo animal, modo machinam belli demonstrat: sic et cetera talia.*”

Discussing types of proper nouns once more, the author of the *APS* lists two more such categories, namely the *feronymon* and the *eponymon* (IX, 96ff.). According to Schad (2007: s.v. *feronymon*), the only instance of *feronymon* in Late Latin grammars occurs in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 540, 4). The corresponding passages in the *Explanationes* and the *APS* are relatively close. The divergence of the text of the *APS* from the *Explanationes* (“*est etiam quod dicunt feronymon*”) is not, in my view, sufficient grounds for changing the text of the *APS*; the divergence might be due to the compiler editing his sources, for instance.¹³⁸ However, based on the text of the *Explanationes*, I have added the conjunction *et* on line 97. Also, based on the text of the *APS*, an emendation, namely *equorum distractione* for the reading *equo*, could be made to the corresponding passage in the *Explanationes*.

The last type of proper name discussed in this passage is the *eponymon*. This term is rare in Late Latin grammars; it is only attested in the passage in the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 540, 5).¹³⁹ The reading in the manuscript M is actually *feronymon*, but the passage in the *Explanationes* corroborates the emendation of that reading to *eponymon*.

The fact that the author of *APS* uses terminology of Greek origin, *dionymon*, *feronymon*, and *eponymon*, not attested in other grammars except the *Explanationes in artem Donati*, in this passage raises interesting questions as to the source or sources he was using. Although these three terms can be found in the *Techne* of Ps.-Dionysius, the examples used in these two texts do not match, except for *Paris Alexander*. Thus the *Techne* is probably not the source for this passage. The examples quoted in the *APS*, such as *Elissa Dido* and “*Dardanio Anchisae*” (*Aen.* 1.617/ 9.647), also clearly point to the Latin grammatical tradition, so we most likely have to be content with accepting a lost Latin source with close ties to Greek grammar for this passage.

The last *accidens* of the noun discussed by the author of the *APS* is case (*casus*) (IX, 98–106). The author states that the number of cases is six; no mention is made of the *septimus casus*,¹⁴⁰ unlike in many other Late Latin grammars¹⁴¹ and also in the passage attributed to Q. Terentius Scaurus in Diomedes’ grammar.¹⁴² After listing the six cases, the author moves on to discuss nouns that are not inflected for all six cases. This discussion takes up the bulk of this section.

¹³⁸ Especially as the compiler has also otherwise reworked the passage, for instance, by leaving out the categories of homonyms and synonyms.

¹³⁹ See Schad (2007: s.v. *eponymon*).

¹⁴⁰ *Septimus casus* (‘the seventh case’) refers to the use of the ablative without a preposition.

¹⁴¹ See, e.g., Charisius (195, 17B), the *Ars Bobiensis* (3, 17–18D), Donatus (625, 2H), Consentius (*GL* 5: 351, 13), Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 550, 15), Audax (*GL* 7: 342,3), Victorinus (*GL* 6: 190, 3), Cleodnius (*GL* 5: 12, 4), and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 317, 23ff.).

¹⁴² Diomedes, *GL* 1: 318, 14ff.

The author of the *APS* does not add any paradigms for nouns when discussing case,¹⁴³ although he later discusses the so-called *formae casuales* (IX, 118ff.), that is, different types of nouns with variation in the number of unique case forms from as many as six (for words like *unus*) to as little as one (for words like *frugi*). In the chapter on the pronoun, the author of *APS* gives the paradigms of *hic*, *haec*, and *hoc* ('this') both in the singular and the plural as an example; however, nothing on inflection is included in the chapter on the participle. Generally speaking, inflection does not receive much attention in the *APS*. In this matter it can be likened to Donatus' *Ars maior*, the *Ars* of Ps.-Asper, or the *Techne* of Ps.-Dionysius, for instance.

Passages similar to the one under scrutiny here (IX, 98–106) can be found also in other grammatical works – for instance, the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius and the *Excerpta Andecavensia* – but no exact match can be found in any of them. Ps.-Sergius, for example, includes a part of this section in his chapter on the noun with the title *De monoptotis* ('On nouns having one case-ending').¹⁴⁴ The corresponding passage in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* (246, 160–171DN) seems to have gone through a reworking of sorts, as the material is presented in a different order in that compilation.

No significant emendations were required in this passage. The manuscript reading *nihil* was changed to *nihili* (IX, 100), based on similar passages in several other grammatical texts.¹⁴⁵ The addition of *huius nequam* into the paradigm of *nequam* ('worthless') on lines 100–101 needs no further comment. The addition of the preposition *per* on line 102 was required to complete the meaning of the sentence. This addition is also corroborated by the corresponding passages in both the *Explanationes* and the *Excerpta Andecavensia*.

After treating all six properties of the noun in the order in which they were listed at the very beginning of the chapter, the author of the *APS* turns to some additional points, mostly concerning the forms of nouns. The first issue discussed after *casus* is how different types of compound nouns or noun phrases are inflected. The types of nouns examined in this discussion (IX, 107ff.) are

¹⁴³ A few lines later, he does, however, include the paradigm for *nequam* ('worthless'). The case forms of this noun remain unchanged in all six cases.

¹⁴⁴ GL 4: 540, 11–15: "*De monoptotis. sunt alia nomina quae per unum casum consuetudo retineat, ut sponte natu tabo. haec enim per ablativum solum in usu efferuntur. sunt alia quae tribus casibus tantum efferuntur, nominativo accusativo vocativo, ut fas nefas: item pluralia, ut maria vina rura aera mella: item numeri a quattuor usque ad centum.*" The passage in the *APS* does not include the term *monoptotis*, that must be an addition by the compiler of the *Explanationes*. Otherwise the passage is identical to the one in the *APS*, apart from the omission that has taken place at the end of the section. The section ends abruptly (*...item numeri a quattuor usque ad centum*), as the rest of that sentence (preserved in the *APS*: "*...minime flectuntur; nam ceteri numeri secundum casum et secundum genera declinantur*") has been lost at some stage.

¹⁴⁵ The reading *nihili* appears in, e.g., the grammars of Charisius (195, 26B), the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (4, 23D), Donatus (625, 8H), Consentius (GL 5: 352, 7), and Victorinus (GL 6: 189, 20). *Nihil* is not attested in any similar passages.

defined as nouns which are inflected jointly in twos (...*nominum, quae binis uocibus iuncta declinantur*). Some of the nouns quoted as examples in this section are in modern terms noun phrases, such as *Falernum uinum* ('wine from Falernum'), whereas others are compound nouns, such as *senatus consultum* ('a decree of the senate'). Curiously, the types of nouns considered compound nouns (*nomina conposita*)¹⁴⁶ by the author of the *APS* – that is, of the type *infelix* ('unhappy') – are not included among the examples. However, the nouns or noun phrases listed here are not referred to as *nomina conposita*, but rather 'nouns inflected jointly in twos'. *Nomina conposita* usually consist of nouns with a prefix attached to them (e.g., *suburbanus*, *infelix*) or else a corrupt (i.e., bound) form of another noun (such as *opifex*). Neither of these fragments (*sub-*, *opi-*) can be inflected for case at all.¹⁴⁷ This is contrary to the types of compound nouns discussed here, such as *senatus consultum* and *tribunus plebis* ('a tribune of the people'), consisting of two full forms of nouns, which could be inflected in the normal way, if they appeared separately.

The same passage appears in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 543, 8–21) after several other points concerning the inflection of nouns presented under the title *De declinatione nominum*.¹⁴⁸ A shorter reworking of the passage can also be found in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* (247, 172–176DN). Other instances where this issue is discussed occur in the *Instituta Artium* (*GL* 4: 120, 30–121, 8), Pompey's commentary (*GL* 5: 179, 3–180, 21), the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (55, 7–16Ma), and the treatise *De nomine* of Ps.-Probus (73, 1–5P). These four other passages are, however, not very closely connected with the one appearing in the *APS*. Diomedes also includes a similar type of discussion in his grammar, entitled *De formis declinationis conpositorum nominum*.¹⁴⁹ Donatus and Consentius integrate a discussion on the subject under the *accidens figura* ('composition'). Although some of the same examples turn up in many these discussions, we can nevertheless find a few key differences between them. The *APS*, the *Explanationes*, and the *Excerpta Andecavensia* call these subtypes *species*,¹⁵⁰ Diomedes, on the other hand, refers to them as *formae* ('(inflectional) forms'), whereas Ps.-Probus, Ps.-Augustinus, Pompey, Donatus, and Consentius give them no name whatsoever.¹⁵¹ Diomedes, Donatus, Consentius, Pompey, and Ps.-Augustine are able to detect the fundamental reason for the existence of these different types,

¹⁴⁶ The examples of *nomina conposita* do not usually include noun phrases, but Consentius is an exception to the rule (*GL* 5: 349, 24–25): "*conponuntur autem nomina quattuor modis, aut ex duabus partibus orationis integris, ut suburbanus, Liber pater, eques Romanus*".

¹⁴⁷ This kind of noun was not usually included in the discussion on how different compound nouns were inflected, but once again Consentius diverges from the rest in including them into his account (*GL* 5: 350, 6–7): "*cetera uero quae sine specie cuiusquam casus priore parte conposita sunt ut simplicia declinabuntur, ut biceps municeps*".

¹⁴⁸ "On the declension of nouns".

¹⁴⁹ "On the inflectional forms of compound nouns".

¹⁵⁰ This use of the term *species* is not mentioned in Schad (2007: s.v. *species*).

¹⁵¹ Donatus, Consentius, and Pompey discuss this issue under the *accidens figura*, so a specific name for this phenomenon is not, perhaps, felt to be required.

namely the fact that in some combinations of nouns both nouns remain in the nominative case, allowing for both nouns to be inflected (e.g., *eques Romanus*, ‘Roman knight’), whereas some combinations have one of the nouns in an oblique (usually the genitive) case, allowing inflection only for the noun in the nominative case (e.g., *tribunus plebis*).¹⁵² The *APS*, the *Explanationes*, the *Excerpta Andecavensia*, and Ps.-Probus (*Instituta artium* and *De nomine*) struggle more with their discussions, as they fail to detect or communicate this key piece of information. They have to rely on merely listing types of noun phrases and compound nouns to capture the essence of this phenomenon.

The first type discussed by the author of the *APS* is a type in which the first part of the compound noun is not inflected, because it is in an oblique case, exemplified by the nouns *Hellespontus* (‘the Hellespont’), *senatus consultum*, and *plebis scitum* (‘a decree of the people’). *Hellespontus* is a Greek loanword, a rare occurrence in these discussions.¹⁵³ *Hellespontus* does, however, resemble the two other nouns exemplifying this subtype in having the first part of the compound noun in the genitive case (albeit in the Greek language). Both *senatus consultum* and *plebis scitum* are examined also elsewhere in similar Late Latin grammatical texts.

The second type of compound noun has an inflecting first part and an uninflected second part. I have made an addition to the text based on the corresponding passage of the *Explanationes*. The addition of “*posterior uero numquam*” (‘the latter never’) at IX, 109–110 was, in my view, required to complete the sense of the passage, as a crucial piece of information would be missing without it. Uninflecting nouns must be considered the unusual case, after all, not inflecting ones. The nouns exemplifying the second type in the *APS* are *tribunus plebis* and *praefectus equitum* (‘the commander of the cavalry’), both of which occur also elsewhere in discussions on this issue.

The third type discussed in the *APS* is the normal noun phrase, where a noun is qualified by an adjective, allowing for both parts to be inflected for case in the normal manner. One of the examples cited, apparently lost in the *Explanationes* and the *Excerpta Andecavensia*, is *Falernum uinum*, which only appears in the *APS*.¹⁵⁴

Most authors discussing this phenomenon are content with presenting three or fewer types in

¹⁵²This idea is expressed most succinctly in Donatus’ *Ars maior* (624, 5–9H): “*in declinatione conpositorum nominum animaduertere debemus, ea, quae ex duobus nominatiuis composita fuerint, ex utraque parte per omnes casus declinari, ut eques Romanus, praetor urbanus; quae ex nominatiuo et quolibet alio casu composita fuerint, ea parte declinari tantum, qua fuerit nominatiuus casus, ut praefectus equitum, senatus consultum.*”

¹⁵³ According to the *CGL* database, the only other instance of the word *Hellespontus* in Late Latin grammars appears in the corresponding passage in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius. Another instance of the word can be found, however, in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* edited by De Nonno. The *De nomine* of Ps.-Probus also has a Greek loanword as an example (*Minotaurus*).

¹⁵⁴ *Falernum uinum* is not found in either of these two texts or the *CGL* database.

their accounts, depending on how they divide and organize their subject matter. The *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine discusses just one type: that is, a compound noun with one inflecting and one uninflecting part.¹⁵⁵ Donatus and his commentator Pompey discuss two types: one type in which both nouns are inflected and another type in which one of the nouns is not.¹⁵⁶ Diomedes, the *Excerpta Andecavensia*, the *Instituta Artium*, and the *De nomine* present three types: one in which both parts are inflected, one in which the first part is inflected and the second is not, and one in which the first part is uninflected and the second is inflected. These three types (not always presented in this order) correspond to the first three types discussed in the *APS* and the *Explanationes*. All in all, the *APS* and the *Explanationes* present four different types. Consentius also discusses four types, but his discussion (*GL* 5: 349, 28–350, 10) is not linked to these two texts.

The fourth and final category in the *APS* consists of the compound noun with a normally inflecting first part and a second part that is not inflected for case but rather for number. The only examples provided here are *pater familias* (‘head of a household’) and *mater familias* (‘mistress of a household’).¹⁵⁷ According to the author, the second part, which is *familias* in all the cases of the singular number, becomes *familiarum* in the plural declension.¹⁵⁸ The compound noun *pater familias* is also discussed elsewhere in the corpus of Late Latin grammars. Diomedes includes it in his category of compound nouns with an uninflected second part, which also contains such examples as *tribunus plebis* and *praefectus equitum*.¹⁵⁹ Pompey also discusses *pater familias* at length (*GL* 5: 179, 22–180, 21), placing this compound noun in the category in which one part is uninflected (namely the part in the oblique case) and one inflects normally (the part in the nominative case).¹⁶⁰ Consentius first presents his four categories (*GL* 5: 349, 28–350, 2), and then he additionally mentions *pater familias* as having a different form in the plural (*GL* 5: 350, 7–10). It

¹⁵⁵ Ps.-Augustine (55, 7–10Ma): “*Sane sunt nomina sub duplici enuntiatione, ut ‘tribunus militum’, ‘praefectus urbi’, ‘praefectus fundis’, ‘praefectus annonae’, ‘praefectus vigilibus’, ‘plebis scitum’, ‘senatus consultum’, quorum nomen una pars declinatur, altera non declinatur’*”. To Ps.-Augustine the order of the parts does not seem to matter, as examples like *tribunus militum* and *senatus consultum* are quoted together.

¹⁵⁶ See n. 152 for Donatus and *GL* 5: 179, 3ff. for Pompey.

¹⁵⁷ The *Explanationes* only gives *pater familias* as an example for this category.

¹⁵⁸ IX, 113–116: “*nam declinamus huius patris familias et huius matris [manen] familias <manente> per omnes <casus> singularitatis immobili secunda uoce. Nam plurali numero mutata ratione ‘horum patrum familiarum’ dicimus.*”

¹⁵⁹ *GL* 1: 309, 30–33: “*secunda est cum ea quae ex nominativo casu singulari et genetivo tam singulari quam plurali conposita fuerint ea parte declinantur qua fuerit nominativus, id est cum prius movetur et posterius non declinatur, ut tribunus plebis, praefectus equitum, tribunus militum, pater et mater familias*”. Diomedes is, of course, correct in doing this, as *familias* is a genitive, like *plebis* or *militum*, and the like.

¹⁶⁰ Pompey gives the paradigm of *pater familias* (*GL* 5: 179, 22–31), “*similiter pater familias: pater nominativus est; familias non est nominativus, sed declinamus ita, huius patris familias, huic patri familias, hunc patrem familias, et similiter cetera. in hoc nomine invenimus [exemplo] varias declinationes. aliquotiens sic declinatur, quem ad modum regula exigit, ut ita dicamus, hic pater familias, huius patris familias, huic patri familias, hunc patrem familias, o pater familias, ab hoc patre familias, hi patres familias, horum patrum familias, his patribus familias, hos patres familias; et ex ordine illud erit immobile*”, but also mentions another possible way of inflecting it in the plural number: “*aliquotiens in numero plurali mutatur, et invenimus hi patres familiae, et iam mutat.*”

is difficult to say whether he means for compound nouns like *pater familias* to constitute yet another category.

There are some textual problems in this passage in the *APS*. On line 114 the participle *manente* has been added to its correct place. In the manuscript it was copied in a corrupt form (*manen*) between the two parts of the compound noun *matris familias*. The addition of *casus* on line 114 was suggested by the similar addition in Keil's edition of the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 543, 18).¹⁶¹

Almost by way of an afterthought, the author of the *APS* adds yet another member to the final category by stating that words like *proconsule* ('proconsul') and *propraetore* ('propraetor')¹⁶² are similar to *pater familias* and *mater familias*.¹⁶³ The second part of *propraetore* cannot be inflected for case like *familias*, but neither can the first part, *pro-*, unlike *pater* or *mater*, which inflect normally. The author declares that the second part inflects for number (like *familias* → *familiarum*), as the plural of *propraetore* is *propraetoribus*. Still, Consentius, who is the only other grammarian to discuss forms like *propraetore* in this context,¹⁶⁴ gives such words their own category: "*aut utraque non declinetur, ut propraetore, proconsule, proquaestore*" (GL 5: 349, 29–30). This seems a clearer solution, although the plural form *propraetoribus* is not mentioned by Consentius. It may not be a coincidence that the compiler of the *Excerpta Andecavensia* has left the fourth category out of his work (if his source ever contained it), as it seems superfluous and, in containing these two diverging types of nouns, not as well thought out as the first three. Unlike *propraetore* and *proconsule*, the rare *promilite* is not found in other Late Latin grammars in addition to the passage in the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 543, 20), which depends on this section of the *APS*.¹⁶⁵

Next, the author of the *APS* turns to the so-called *formae casuales*, which are lists of nominal paradigms containing a varying number of different inflectional forms (IX, 118ff.). These types of paradigms are discussed in numerous Late Antique Latin grammars from Sacerdos' grammar (GL 6: 483, 31–34), the earliest grammar preserved in any significant length, up to Priscian (GL 2: 187, 15–188, 21), in the sixth century. There are, however, some notable differences in these discussions.

¹⁶¹ Keil has emended the manuscript reading "*per omnes singularitate immobile*" to "*per omnes casus in singularitate immobili*". In M the manuscript reading is "*per omnes singularitatis immobili*", and the emended form is "*per omnes casus singularitatis immobili*".

¹⁶² Although written as one word (in the *APS* and in other grammars), the phrase *pro praetore* or *pro consule* means 'in place of a consul/a praetor'. This was how certain officials were referred to when they were sent to serve in the provinces after completing a year in office in Rome. Grammarians generally prefer the forms *proconsul* or *propraetor*, as they think masculine nouns ending in *e* (even uninflecting ones like *propraetore*) cannot exist.

¹⁶³ IX, 116–117: "*Eiusdem formae sunt 'promilite, proconsule, propraetore', cum indiuisse pronuntiantur; nam in pluralitate 'his propraetoribus' et 'his proconsulibus' dicimus.*"

¹⁶⁴ Other grammarians mention such forms, but usually in discussions on whether there can exist masculine nouns ending in the letter *e*. See, e.g., the *Instituta artium* (GL 4: 126, 12ff.) and Cledonius' work (GL 5: 12, 33ff.).

¹⁶⁵ The rare form *promilite* is, however, found in the commentary on Virgil's Aeneid by Servius. The word appears in his commentary on verse 2.157, where he is quoting Sallust (Hist. frag. 8, "*neu quis miles, neve pro milite*").

Firstly, the terminology used in these passages varies in the grammars. Priscian, Servius, Diomedes,¹⁶⁶ and Donatus, for instance, use terminology of Greek origin for each of the types discussed (e.g., *hexaptota* for nouns with six different cases, *pentaptota* for five, and so on). Similar terminology is attested in Greek grammar in the scholia of Dionysius Thrax.¹⁶⁷ Other grammarians, including Charisius, Cledonius, Ps.-Probus (*Catholica*, *De nomine*), and the author of the *APS*, use Latin terminology in naming the aforementioned types of nouns (e.g., *senaria*, *quinaria*, *quaternaria*, and so on). Secondly, there are differences as to the use of particular terms: for example, *aptota* might be used by one grammarian to describe nouns with only one form for all six cases, whereas in another grammar *monoptota* might be used instead (cf. Schad 2007: s.v. *aptotus*). These differences exist also for the Latin terminology: *unaria*, *simplex*, or *unita* might be used for nouns with only one form, and *binaria* or *bipertita* for those with two, and so on. Thirdly, there are differences as to the phenomenon to which these terms refer. Diomedes presents two diverging types of *formae casuales*: the first type of *formae casuales* is labelled with Latin terms, and these terms (e.g., *senaria*) refer to the type of noun that inflects for all cases, but each *forma* has a varying number of diverging case forms – that is, while *unus* has different case forms for all six cases, *nequam* remains in the same form throughout the paradigm. This is the more prevalent type of *formae casuales* in Late Latin grammars. Then Diomedes goes on to describe another type of *formae casuales*, this time using terminology of Greek origin. This passage describes a different phenomenon, namely that of nouns inflecting only for one (or two, three, etc.) case, like *sponte* (‘willingly’), which only ever appears in the ablative singular, according to Diomedes. Priscian apparently includes both types in his discussion.¹⁶⁸ It is hard to say exactly what Donatus is referring to from his telegraphic description of the issue.¹⁶⁹ His commentator Servius offers an interpretation that would suggest that Donatus is, perhaps, in line with the majority of grammarians in referring with the *formae casuales* to normally inflecting nouns with a varying number of

¹⁶⁶ In including both Greek and Latin terminology Diomedes has probably, once again, combined material from two (or more) sources. Cf. the discussions at *GL* 1: 309, 12ff: “*sunt quoque alio genere monoptota, quae per ablativum tantum modo enuntiantur et ob id monoptota dicuntur, ut sponte natu tabo. item diptota ...*” and *GL* 1: 308, 7ff: “*simplicium nominum formae casuales sunt sex, senaria quinaria quaternaria ternaria bipertita simplex vel unita...*”.

¹⁶⁷ E.g., *pentaptota* and *tetraptota*, and so on. See *GG* 1/1, 231, 1ff. See also Schad (2007: s.v. *aptotus*, *pentaptotus*, *tetraptotus* etc.).

¹⁶⁸ Priscian (*GL* 2: 188, 3–13): “*Diptota sunt, quae duos diuersos casus habent tantum, ut uerua ueribus (nam ueruum in usu non inuenimus) et fors forte ... tabi et tabo. alia triptota, qualia sunt omnia neutra secundae declinationis in singulari numero, ut templum templi templo, et in plurali tam in secunda quam in tertia et quarta, is est omnia neutra pluralia, ut templa templorum templis, sidera siderum sideribus, cornua cornuum cornibus.*” Here Priscian first calls defective nouns that only have two existing cases (e.g., *fors*, *forte*) *diptota*, then he labels normally inflecting nouns (e.g., *templum*) that make do with three different forms for all six cases as *triptota*.

¹⁶⁹ Donatus 625, 5–8H: “*sunt autem formae casuales sex, ex quibus sunt nomina alia monoptota, alia diptota, alia triptota, alia tetraptota, alia pentaptota, alia hexaptota. sunt praeter haec aptota, quae neque per casus neque per numeros declinantur, ut frugi, nihili, nequam, fas, nefas, nugas.*”

diverging case forms for the six cases of the Latin language.¹⁷⁰

The author of the *APS* uses Latin terminology in his discussion. The closest parallels to this passage can be found in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 544, 15–35) and the grammar of Charisius (191, 15–192, 18B),¹⁷¹ where also the section referring to the plural forms can be found in full, unlike in the *Explanationes*, where lines 134–138 have not been preserved.¹⁷² Other relatively close passages can be found in the *De nomine* of Ps.-Probus (72, 7–26P) and the *Excerpta Andecavensia* (245, 97–117DN). Some similarities can also be found in Diomedes' account (*GL* 1: 308, 6ff.), but he has, by the look of that passage, again combined several sources. The *formae casuales* for plural paradigms are not discussed in most of the grammars mentioned above. Other than the *APS* (and the brief mention in the *Explanationes*) and Charisius' work, which seem to share the same source, only Priscian and the *Catholica* of Ps.-Probus mention *formae casuales* for words in the plural number.

There are some textual problems in this passage, most of which can be emended with some certainty. The emendation of the manuscript reading *efferruntur* to *effertur* on line 119 is corroborated by the texts of both the *Explanationes* and Charisius' grammar. There is a significant omission in the manuscript M, of everything from *ut doctus* on line 121 to *declinationibus* on line 123. The reason for this omission is clear: *saut du même au même* – that is, the scribe has inadvertently skipped from one instance of the word *declinationibus* to another appearing a few lines down and failed to copy everything between. We have, however, the text of the *Explanationes* to turn to for the missing information.¹⁷³ There are two other emendations to this passage. The addition of *genu* to the text on line 132 requires no further explanation. The emendation of the manuscript reading *et* to *est* on line 128 is both suggested by the fact that the sentence requires a verb and corroborated by the text of the *Explanationes*.

¹⁷⁰ Servius (*GL* 4: 433, 26–434, 2): “*inflexionum autem varietates in casibus sex sunt. aliquando enim omnes casus varios exitus sumunt, ut est unus, quae dicitur forma hexaptota: item pentaptota dicitur, ubi quinque sunt varietates, ut doctus; item tetraptota, ubi quattuor, ut est species; triptota, ubi tres, ut est templum; diptota, ubi duae, ut est cornu genu: nam nominativus accusativus et vocativus corripiuntur, alii tres producuntur. est etiam monoptota, quam non bene monoptotam, sed aptotam dicimus, ut est nequam. nam monoptota illa sunt, ubi unus tantum casus est, ut sponte; aptota vero illa sunt, ubi omnes quidem sunt casus, sed nulla ratione variantur, ut est frugi. inveniuntur autem nomina unum casum habentia tantum, ut natu tabo; aut duo tantum, ut hic Iuppiter o Iuppiter; aut tres tantum, ut hoc nefas hoc nefas o nefas; aut quattuor tantum, ut huius dicionis huic dicioni hanc dicionem ab hac dicione.*”

¹⁷¹ Charisius does not name his source for this passage.

¹⁷² In the *Explanationes* the section ends with “*pluralis vero numerus aut quaternariam formam habet aut ternariam*” (*GL* 4: 544, 34–35). The remaining information has either been lost in the transmission of the text or its source, or it has been deliberately left out. This is also possible, as the *formae casuales* of the plural forms seem not to have been as popular a topic among Latin grammarians as those of the singular forms, which show more variation.

¹⁷³ The text of Charisius' grammar is of no use at this point, as the text differs slightly from that of the *APS* and the *Explanationes*. In Charisius' work, the reason for the *saut du même au même* does not exist, as in place of the second instance of “(*sociantur in*) *declinationibus*” the text reads “*invenitur nominativus idem qui et vocativus*” (191, 25B).

Next, the author of the *APS* presents the rules for forming (plural) case forms on the basis of the ending of the ablative singular. There is no mention of the five declensions for nouns in this grammar; in addition to a list of the six cases (IX, 98–99) and the *formae casuales* (which are merely descriptive and do not help with producing the different case forms of a given word), this passage (IX, 139–157) is the only one dealing with the inflection of nouns. Although passages of varying length and scope can be found on this subject in Late Antique Latin grammars, only the one preserved in the *Explanationes* comes close to the *APS* in its wording.

In the first century BC, Varro included a passage in his *De lingua Latina* (10.62) describing the usefulness of the ablative singular ending in predicting the other case forms.¹⁷⁴ Daniel Taylor attributes the discovery of the *regula ablatiui* or at least its institutionalization to Varro (1991: 96), a fact that seems at least partly supported by a fragment from Pliny.¹⁷⁵ Regardless of its discoverer, the role of the ablative singular in forming other cases remains central in Latin grammars also in Late Antiquity. This is the case even after the role of the genitive in predicting other case forms was discovered,¹⁷⁶ although, naturally, the scope of the *regula ablatiui* became, in time, somewhat reduced. For instance, Diomedes devotes six pages to his discussion on how the plural case forms can be formed based on the ending of the ablative singular (*GL* 1: 303, 30–308, 5);¹⁷⁷ in contrast, he describes the genitive-based declensions in just one passage (*GL* 1: 303, 12–29). Charisius includes a lengthy discussion on both the genitive-based declensions (*ordines*) and the plural forms based on the ablative singular ending in his grammar. Consentius prefers to rely on the ablative singular ending to produce the plural endings and on the genitive singular to produce the singular endings.¹⁷⁸ The ablative singular ending as the basis for other case forms is not mentioned at all by Priscian in his *Institutio de nomine*, where nominal inflection is described in the framework of the genitive-based declensions (5, 3–21, 9P).

¹⁷⁴ L. 10.62: “*Sin ab singulari quis potius proficisci volet, initium facere oportebit ab sexto casu, qui est proprius Latinus: nam eius casus litterarum discriminibus facilius reliquorum varietate discernere poterit, quod ei habent exitus aut in a ut hac terra, aut in e ut hac lance, aut in i ut hac levi, aut in o ut hoc caelo, aut in u ut hoc versu. Igitur ad demonstrandas declinationes biceps via haec.*”

¹⁷⁵ See the fragment in Funaioli (1907: 275 fr. 256) or Mazzarino (1955: 278–279). However, Taylor points out also another fragment (Funaioli 1907: 149 fr. 6), which suggests that the role of the ablative may have been known already before Varro’s *De lingua Latina* (1991: 96 n. 16).

¹⁷⁶ The first extant discussion on the genitive-based declensions can be found in Sacerdos’ late third-century grammar (*GL* 6: 471–483). Sacerdos’ system required some further refinement, and he also reserved the ablative singular a role in predicting the genitive, dative, and ablative plural forms of a given noun (Taylor 1991: 98).

¹⁷⁷ In his discussion, Diomedes organizes the material alphabetically according to the ending of the ablative singular, much like Varro had in his brief description (see n. 174 above). The Late Latin grammarians improve upon Varro in separating the declensions of the nouns with a long *e* and a short *e* as the ablative singular ending. The early fourth-century *Instituta artium* devotes more than 40 pages to the inflection of nouns under the title *De ablativo casu*. The paradigms are organized alphabetically and contain both the singular and the plural forms. According to Taylor, the *Instituta artium* betrays no knowledge whatsoever of a genitive-based system or declensional affiliation (1991: 97).

¹⁷⁸ *GL* 5: 359, 10–12: “*Haec sunt declinationis discrimina in numero singulari, quae nos via quadam ad ablativum ducunt, qui declinationem rursum numeri pluralis informat.*”

The author of the *APS* betrays no knowledge of the declensions based on the genitive singular ending. He is not the only Late Latin grammarian to fail to include these genitive-based declensions in his work. Donatus, too, fails to do so, a negligence later corrected by his commentators.¹⁷⁹ The grammarians who omit any mention of the declensions based on the genitive singular seem to belong to the earlier part of the fourth century: the *Institua artium*, Cominianus' grammar,¹⁸⁰ Donatus' works, Victorinus' grammar, and the *APS*. They all rely only on the ablative singular to predict the other case forms. The discussions in these aforementioned grammars vary somewhat in their length and the order in which the endings are discussed. Cominianus and the author of the *APS* discuss first the types of nouns ending in *a* and *o*, as they produce similar endings in the genitive, dative, and ablative plural. Then they add the two types of nouns ending in *e* (long or short), followed by those ending in *i* and those in ending in *u*. Victorinus discusses the nouns ending in *a* or *o* in the ablative singular together, followed by the rest. Donatus follows the alphabetical order (*a, e, i, o, u*) in the *Ars maior*, but uses a briefer version of the order used by Victorinus (*a* and *o*, then the rest of the endings) in the *Ars minor*. The *Instituta artium* has two discussions on the subject: first, a long, alphabetically organized discussion that spans more than 40 pages and then, toward the end of the chapter on the noun (*GL* 4: 123, 8–29), another, much shorter, discussion in which the endings are treated in the following order: *a* and *o*, long *e, u*, short *e, i*.¹⁸¹

The passage in the *APS* contains several textual problems, none of which is very serious for our understanding of the sense of this passage. There is some confusion in the endings of the words *littera* and *syllaba* in the manuscript, with vacillation between the ablative and the accusative endings (e.g., on lines 144, 151, and 155). On line 146 there is an omission; the manuscript reads: “*nam correptae ultimam perdunt et...*”. *Correptae*, however, does not make sense as the subject of the sentence. The *Explanationes* also has a similar omission at this point; in fact, the problem is exacerbated by the fact that there are two omissions in the *Explanationes* (also the section from *producta* on line 147 to *rebus* on line 151 is missing). We must look a few lines down in the text of the *APS* for help with this omission. The reading *correptae* must be contrasted with “*Producta e terminata*” at the beginning of the next sentence, resulting in the emendation *correpta e <terminata>*. Finally, the manuscript reading *facili* has been emended to *facilibus* on line 153 to agree with *agilibus*.

¹⁷⁹ See, for instance, Servius (*GL* 4:408, 36ff.).

¹⁸⁰ Charisius has attributed a discussion on the ablative singular endings to Cominianus (187, 7–188, 10B), but nothing on genitive-based declensions is attributed to him. Naturally, we have no way of knowing for certain whether Cominianus was aware of the genitive-based declensions or not.

¹⁸¹ Possibly this order is based on the genitive plural ending, which is *-rum* for the first three types and *-(i)um* for the last three. For this kind of order elsewhere, see Taylor (1991: 105, 105 n. 27).

Continuing with material dealing with case forms, the author of the *APS* then adds a small chapter (IX, 158–164) entitled *De accusatiuo plurali*.¹⁸² In the previous section, the formation of the plural genitives, datives, and ablatives was described for nouns of all types (based on the ablative singular ending). In this passage the formation of the accusative plural is discussed, but only for the nouns that end in the letter *i* in the ablative singular (i.e., third declension adjectives and nouns with stems in *-i*). Some grammarians discuss such material for every type of noun, as in the chapter *De ablativo casu* in the *Instituta artium*, or for all declensions, like Priscian. Still, the author of the *APS* seems justified in singling out the nouns with the ablative singular ending in *i*,¹⁸³ as they display more variation than the other types. We can notice this already in the previous passage, where the accusative case was only mentioned in connection with this type of noun.¹⁸⁴ Donatus integrates the issue of the accusative case (plural as well as singular) into the discussion on the endings of the ablative singular in his *Ars maior*.¹⁸⁵

The passage in question (IX, 158–164) is included also in the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 545, 1–9), but no other directly related passages can be found in Late Latin grammars. The compiler of the *Explanationes* places this passage after the section on the *formae casuales* (GL 4: 544, 15–35), not following the passage on the ablative singular as in the *APS*. The reference to *ueteres* (IX, 162) may disguise a reference to Valerius Probus, as Gellius attributes a very similar discussion to him in his *Noctes Atticae* (13.21).¹⁸⁶

There are some textual issues that require comment in this short passage. The removal of the manuscript reading *quem* (IX, 159) seems to be corroborated by the text of the *Explanationes*, where no trace of it exists. Another possibility would be to emend *quem* to *quae*, which would then act as the proleptic to the following *eadem* (IX, 160).¹⁸⁷ The reading *accepta* was corrected to

¹⁸² IX, 158–164: “*De accusatiuo plurali. ‘Has puppis, has classis, hos agilis’ accusatiuo plurali pronuntiare debemus, quoniam [quem] nomina i littera terminata ablatiuo singulari acceptis um litteris faciunt genetiuum pluralem, eadem accusatiuo plurali in is litteras exeunt, ut ab hac puppi, harum puppium, has puppis, et ab hac turri, harum turrium, has turris. Sed plerumque ueteres horum nominum ablatiuo singulari e pro i littera terminauerunt, ut ‘urbe Mycenae’, et accusatiuos plurales es pro is litteris enuntiauerunt, ut ‘centum urbes habitant magnas’.*”

¹⁸³ Ablatives ending in the letter *i* contain both what we would call third declension adjectives (here *has agilis*) as well as third declension nouns with *i*-stems or mixed *i*-stems.

¹⁸⁴ IX, 153–155: “*Accusatiuo quoque in is syllabam exhibunt, quia detracta s littera et apposita a, neutrum genus ex se facere oportet, ut haec facilia.*”

¹⁸⁵ 626, 14–627, 5H: “*quaecumque nomina ablatiuo casu singulari i littera fuerint terminata, genetiuum pluralem in ium syllabam mittunt, datiuum et ablatiuum in bus, ut ab hac puppi, harum puppium, his et ab his puppibus. huius modi nomina casum accusatiuum pluralem propter differentiam melius in is quam in es syllabam terminant, ut has puppis, nauis, clauis. eorum autem nominum, quae genetiuo casu plurali in ium syllabam exire possunt, trina regula est: una eorum est, quae nominatiuo casu singulari n et s litteris terminantur, ut mons, montium; altera eorum, quae ablatiuo casu singulari e correpta finiuntur et feminina sunt, ut ab hac clade, harum cladum; tertia eorum, quae ablatiuo casu singulari i littera terminantur, ut ab hac resti, harum restium. sed haec regula etiam accusatiuum casum singularem interdum per i litteram profert, ut hanc restim, hanc puppim.*”

¹⁸⁶ I would like to thank Prof. De Nonno for calling my attention to the passage in Gellius (13.21).

¹⁸⁷ I would like to offer my thanks to Professor De Nonno for suggesting this emendation.

acceptis on line 159, following the text of the *Explanationes*. The Virgil quotation on line 163 (“*urbe Mycenae*”, *Aen.* 5.52) has not been preserved in the *Explanationes*, where instead the manuscript, L, reads “*urbe scenę*”. That reading has been emended by Keil to “*urbe sene*”. I prefer the *lectio difficilior* preserved in M and consider the reading in L a corruption of it. The only other instance where *Aen.* 5.52 is quoted in the corpus of Late Antique Latin grammars is in Priscian’s *Institutiones* in an unrelated passage on grammatical number.¹⁸⁸

The *APS* does not incorporate a great deal of the material that is more at home in the *regulae*-type grammars. However, at the very end of the chapter (IX, 165–167), the author lists nouns ending in the letters *us* and some types of adverbs derived from them (e.g., *bonus*, *bene*). There are few parallel passages in *Schulgrammatik*-type texts, and the parallels to these lines tend to occur in the section on the adverb, not the noun.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁸ Priscian (*GL* 2: 176, 15–19): “*alia contra intellectu singularia, voce pluralia, ut Athenae, Thebae, Mycenae, Maenala, Gargara, Tartara, Dindyma, Bactra. inveniuntur tamen in his quaedam etiam singulariter prolata idem significantia. Virgilius in V: «Argolicove mari depressus et urbe Mycena».*”

¹⁸⁹ Cf., e.g., Charisius (237, 14–17B), Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 443, 6–8), and the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (117, 13–17Ma), where the chapter entitled *item de adverbiiis* comes from a *Schulgrammatik*-type source (Martorelli 2011: 293).

3.7 De pronomine

The chapter on the pronoun in the *APS* is rather brief, containing little extraneous material in addition to the discussion on the *accidentia* of the pronoun. The chapter begins with the definition of the pronoun, which is followed by an interesting example of the use of pronouns in place of nouns. Next, the author lists the six *accidentia* of the pronoun, which are then discussed in that order.

The definition of the pronoun occurring in the *APS* is not unique to this grammar.¹ Similar definitions can be found in several other Late Latin grammars, for instance, in grammars belonging to the Charisius group. The definition appearing in the *APS* also corresponds to the definition of the pronoun in the early fourth-century *Instituta artium*.² Unfortunately, the definition of the pronoun in Sacerdos' late third-century grammar has not been preserved, as the chapters on the noun and the pronoun have been lost in the course of the transmission of that text. There is relatively little variation among the essential definitions of the pronoun preserved in Late Latin grammars. Indeed, Luhtala suggests that this lack of variation could be attributed to the fact that the definitions of the pronoun as well as the conjunction, the adverb, and the participle "largely maintain the contents of the earlier, etymological or etymologico-functional definitions" (2002: 279).³ The definition of the

¹ XI, 3–4: "*Pronomen est pars orationis, quae pro ipso posita nomine minus quidem plene idem tamen significat.*" Very similar definitions have come down to us also in the grammars of Charisius (200, 9–10B), "*Pronomen est pars orationis quae posita pro nomine minus quidem plene, idem tamen significat*", the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (39, 26–27D ≈ Dositheus, 27, 2–4Bo) "*Pronomen est pars orationis quae pro ipso posita nomine minus quidem plene, idem tamen significat, ut ego tu hic ille*", the *Explanaciones in Donatum* (GL 4: 545, 21–22), "*pronomen est pars orationis, quae posita pro quolibet nomine minus quidem plene, tamen idem significat*", the *Excerpta* of Audax (GL 7: 343, 9–10), "*Quid est pronomen? Pars orationis dicta, quod pro ipso posita nomine minus quidem plene, idem tamen significet*", the *Instituta Artium* of Ps.-Probus (GL 4:131, 2–3), "*Pronomen est pars orationis, quae posita pro nomine minus quidem plene, idem tamen significat, ut puta ego ipse quis et cetera talia*", and Augustine (*Ars breuiata* III, § 1W, *De magistro*: V, 13), "*Pronomen est pars orationis quae pro ipso nomine posita minus quidem plene idem tamen significat*". For the emendation of *bene* to *plene* in Augustine's definition, see Luhtala (2005: 140). Also the definition found in the grammar of Ps.-Asper (GL 5: 550, 25–26) is relatively close to the definitions quoted above: "*Pronomen est pars orationis quae idem quod nomen, sed minus quidem plene significat.*"

² Most of the definitions of the word classes quoted by Ps.-Probus in his *Instituta artium* are truncated, that is, they state only the *genus* to which the word class belongs (*pars orationis*), for example: "*Nomen est scilicet pars orationis*" (GL 4: 51, 21). The definitions for the participle (GL 4: 138, 27), the preposition (GL 4: 147, 4), the adverb (GL 4: 150, 29), and the verb (GL 4: 155, 32) run along similar lines. Only the definitions for the pronoun (n. 1 above), the conjunction (GL 4: 143, 24), and the interjection (GL 4: 146, 2) are fully formed. According to Luhtala (2002: 275), the truncated definitions could be interpreted as "yet another trace of the renovation of definitions taking place in the late 3rd and early 4th century, whereby definitions were in the process of being cast into the form 'x is a part of speech'."

³ Some *regulae*-type grammars and some of the commentaries on Donatus' works preserve these etymological definitions, which probably preceded the essential definitions. See, e.g., *Ps.-Augustini Regulae* (55, 21–22Ma): "*Ideo pronomen dicitur, quia vicem fungitur nominis, ut 'hic', 'ille', 'iste', 'ipse'*", Servius (GL 4: 409, 35–36): "*Pronomen dictum est, quia ponitur pro nomine, ut si quis dicat 'Vergilius scripsit bucolica, ipse scripsit georgica'*", and Ps.-Sergius (GL 4: 498, 36–499,1): "*Pronomen dictum est quasi pro nomine, eo quod fungitur officio nominis; ideo dicitur pronomen*". These etymological or etymologico-functional definitions invite comparison with a fragment attributed to Varro: "*pronomen quia fungitur officio nominis, praemisso nomine*" (Goetz-Schoell 1910: 232).

pronoun did, however, undergo some further changes in Late Antiquity, as witnessed by the grammars of Donatus, Diomedes, and Priscian, which introduce the reference to (definite) person to the definition.⁴ That criterion most likely originates from the definition of the pronoun of Apollonius Dyscolus (*GG* 2/3, 11–13), whose doctrine had undergone a process of simplification in the intervening centuries (Luhtala 2005: 104, 140).

In the *APS*, directly after the definition of the pronoun, there is an interesting example of the use of pronouns in place of nouns: “*Nam cum debeam dicere: ‘artem Scaurus scripsit’, dico: ‘artem ille scripsit’, et pro ‘artem Scaurus scripsisti’ dico: ‘artem tu scripsisti’*” (X, 4–5).⁵ The name of the grammarian mentioned twice in this example, Scaurus, coincides with the attribution of this text by Ps.-Sergius. In her 1987 article, Law suggested that this example could reveal the author’s identity; however, she also considered the possibility that the example could be the reason behind Ps.-Sergius’ attribution (1987: 73 n. 15). According to my research (see chapters 1.2 and 1.3 above), the *APS* cannot be attributed to Q. Terentius Scaurus, the second century AD grammarian. But is there any evidence for the existence of another, later Scaurus? There is no information in the manuscript on the identity of the author of the *APS*. However, in her article, Law brings up the “relatively common practice in Late Antiquity for grammarians to use their own names as examples” (1987: 73 n. 15).⁶ It seems that this practice has not been studied in much detail. Also, Priscian, who does use his own name as an example in his texts, often uses it in connection with first-person pronouns or verbs, for instance.⁷ In the *APS*, however, only the second- and third-person pronouns are used in connection with the name Scaurus. In my opinion, the name of a famous grammarian might well be used as an example in a grammatical work, and the compiler of the *Explanationes*, or someone before him, could have based his attribution on the aforementioned example, possessing no more information than we do.

Relatively few Late Latin grammarians include examples in the definitions of the pronoun.⁸

⁴ Donatus, *Ars maior* (629, 2–3H): “*Pronomen est pars orationis, quae pro nomine posita tantundem paene significat personamque interdum recipit*”, Diomedes (*GL* 1: 329, 2–3): “*Pronomen est pars orationis quae pro ipso nomine posita minus quidem, paene idem tamen significat personamque interdum recipit*”, and Priscian (*GL* 2: 577, 2–3): “*Pronomen est pars orationis, quae pro nomine proprio uniuscuiusque accipitur personasque finitas recipit*”. Cf. also the definition used by Ps.-Dionysius Thrax in his *Techne* (*GG* 1/1, 63, 1–2). Discussions on the development of the definition of the pronoun in Late Antiquity can be found in Carraro (1999: 84–88) and Holtz (1981: 125–127).

⁵ “For instance, when I should say ‘Scaurus wrote a grammar’, I can say ‘he wrote a grammar’, and for ‘Scaurus, (you) wrote a grammar’, I can say ‘you wrote a grammar’.”

⁶ Cf. the discussion on p. 17 n. 98 above. Ancient grammarians did, however, use also other grammarians’ names as examples, cf. Priscian (*GL* 3: 13, 14–16): “*dicimus enim vel Probus vel Donatus, et Priscianus et Theoctistus, et ego et ille, vel mei vel tui, et mihi et tibi, vel me vel te, et a me et a te*”.

⁷ See, for example, *GL* 3: 12, 15–16: “*...Priscianus ego vocor, tu vocaris Herodianus.*”

⁸ Ps.-Probus does, however, discuss one aspect of his definition, providing several examples as he does so (*GL* 4: 131, 2–5): “*Pronomen est pars orationis, quae posita pro nomine minus quidem plene, idem tamen significat, ut puta ego*

Dositheus (27, 3–4Bo) and the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (39, 26–27D) add the pronouns *ego*, *tu*, *hic*, and *ille* to the definition, but mostly it is the commentators of Donatus who discuss the use of pronouns in place of nouns.⁹ In their commentaries, they also examine the differences in meaning or style between the nouns and pronouns they discuss. In the *APS*, the example occurring after the definition illustrates some aspects of the preceding definition, but the author does not comment on, for instance, whether the pronouns and nouns occurring in his example signify the same.

On lines 5–6, the author of the *APS* lists the *accidentia* of the pronoun: quality, gender, number, composition, person, and case. Six is by far the most common number of *accidentia* for the pronoun, with the ones listed above the most prevalent in Late Antique Latin grammars. Diomedes and Ps.-Probus have a list of seven *accidentia*, whereas Ps.-Asper has a list of nine.¹⁰

The author of the *APS* discusses the *qualitas pronominum* first.¹¹ The term *qualitas* is used in conjunction with several parts of speech, but in pronouns it refers to the characteristic of being definite or indefinite. *Qualitas* is divided into two subcategories in the *APS*: *finita* and *infinita*. This division is the most common one in Late Latin grammars, appearing in, e.g., the grammars of Charisius, Dositheus, Donatus,¹² Ps.-Asper, and the *Anonymus Bobiensis*. Divisions of *qualitas* into three or four types also occur.¹³

The definition of *qualitas finita* in the *APS* is the following: “*finita est quae notat certum*

ipse quis et cetera talia; et ideo minus quidem plene, quoniam restat ut definiatur, ut puta ego Cato, ipse Cicero, quis Terentius”.

⁹ See, for instance, the example discussed in Servius’ commentary (*GL* 4: 409, 35–410, 1): “*Pronomen dictum est, quia ponitur pro nomine, ut si quis dicat ‘Virgilius scripsit bucolica, ipse scripsit georgica.’ nec tamen videntur pronomina, quoniam nomen funguntur officio, esse nomina. nam etsi nomen vim expriment, non tamen plene expriment. nomina enim posita plenas faciunt elocutiones, pronomina semiplenas. item nomina posita velut inchoant elocutiones, pronomina autem velut complent.*” Similar examples appear also elsewhere, e.g., the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 499, 13–15): “*nam totiens dicere ‘Virgilius scripsit bucolica, Virgilius scripsit georgica, Virgilius scripsit Aeneidos’ odiosum est, cum possis variare, ut dicas ‘Virgilius scripsit bucolica, idem georgica, ipse Aeneidos’*”, and Pompey (*GL* 5: 199, 23–200, 5).

¹⁰ Diomedes lists seven properties, adding *ordo* to the six *accidentia* mentioned above. Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta artium* also has a list of seven, adding *accentus* to the six. Ps.-Asper includes nine *accidentia* in his list, with *significatio*, *positio*, and *ordo* added to those more often found in Late Latin grammars.

¹¹ X, 7–9: “*Qualitatis species sunt duae: finita et infinita; finita est quae notat certum numerum certamque personam, ut ‘ego, tu, ille’, infinita est quae cuilibet personae potest applicari, ut ‘quis, quantus, qualis’.*”

¹² Donatus’ both grammars contain a division of *qualitas* into two subcategories (558, 5–7H and 629, 5–7H). In the *Ars maior*, however, immediately following this bipartite division, Donatus adds “*sunt etiam pronomina minus quam finita, ut ipse, iste*” (629, 8H). He then adds more categories of pronouns (*praepositiua*, *subiunctiua*, *gentis*, *ordinis*, and so on), so it remains unclear whether he meant to include the *minus quam finita* under *qualitas*. The commentators of Donatus retain his division into *finita* and *infinita*, but often add a subdivision for the category *infinita*, including thus also *minus quam finita* and *possessiva* under indefinite pronouns. Cf. Servius (*GL* 4: 410, 1ff.): “*qualitas pronominum principaliter bipartita est*”, Servius (*GL* 4: 435, 25–31), and Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 500, 4ff.).

¹³ Diomedes and Audax, for instance, divide *qualitas* into three subcategories, adding *minus quam finita* to the two types mentioned above (Diomedes, *GL* 1: 329, 5 and Audax, *GL* 7: 343, 12–17). Ps.-Probus adds yet another category, the possessive pronouns (*possessiva*), bringing the number of the subcategories of *qualitas* up to four. Finally, Priscian does not include this property (*qualitas*) in his discussion on the pronoun at all, as for him all pronouns denote a definite person, and indefinite pronouns should be understood as indefinite nouns. In this he follows the doctrine of Apollonius Dyscolus (cf. Luhtala 2005: 110ff.).

numerus certamque personam, ut ego, tu, ille” (X, 7–8). *Numerus* (‘number’) is not usually mentioned in the definitions of *qualitas finita*, which otherwise coincide with the definition occurring in the *APS*.¹⁴ Although the examples included in these discussions (e.g., *ego*, ‘I’) do naturally designate also a specific number as well as a specific person, it is understandable that most grammars should focus on person at this point, as it is at the core of the issue. Nevertheless, the *Explanationes*, which seems to follow the *APS* on this matter,¹⁵ preserves the reading: “*quae notat certum numerum certamque personam*” (GL 4: 545, 24–25). As similar mentions of number in conjunction with the definition of *qualitas finita* can be found in other grammars as well¹⁶ – that is to say, as we are not dealing with some error that has found its way to the *Explanationes* through the *APS* – we can more confidently accept the manuscript reading *certum numerum* into the edited text of the *APS*. One emendation based on the *Explanationes* has been made to the text at this point, namely the addition of the conjunction *-que* (X, 8).

Next, the author makes a brief mention on a matter that in some grammars is discussed as a property of its own, that is, *ordo*.¹⁷ This discussion on lines 10–11 concerns pronouns occurring toward the beginning or the end of a sentence.¹⁸ Donatus mentions the *pronomina praepositiva* and *subiunctiva* without assigning a special category for this issue,¹⁹ as does the author of the *APS*. In addition, there are grammarians who treat the matter in a slightly different context; for instance, Priscian brings up this issue when explaining the difference between demonstrative and relative pronouns.²⁰ Charisius includes an interesting mention on this issue in his chapter on the pronoun; he states that this phenomenon helps to distinguish pronouns from nouns and participles (see n. 21).

¹⁴ Cf. the grammar of Charisius and those by the other members of the Charisius group. Charisius (200, 12–15B): “*qualitas pronominum finita est aut infinita. finita est quae notat certam personam, ut ego tu ille. infinita est quae cuilibet personae potest aptari, ut quis quantus qualis*”, the *Ars Bobiensis* (40, 2–4D): “*qualitas pronominum aut finita est aut infinita. finita est quae notat certam personam, ut ego tu ille. infinita est quae cuilibet personae potest accommodari, ut quis qualis quae*” ≈ Dositheus (27, 5–8Bo).

¹⁵ In this case, however, the two passages do not coincide word for word. Cf. the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 545, 24–26): “*qualitas pronominum aut finita est aut infinita. finita est quae notat certum numerum certamque personam, ut ego tu ille; infinita quae non designat, cui adcommodata sit, ut quantus qualis*.”

¹⁶ See Diomedes (GL 1: 329, 7–8): “*finita est quae notat certum numerum et gestum dirigit ad certam personam, ut ego*” and Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 131, 26–27): “*finita pronomina sunt, quae notant certum numerum, certam personam. haec tria sunt tantum, ego tu ille*.”

¹⁷ Diomedes and Ps.-Asper include *ordo* (‘order’) in their lists of the properties of the pronoun. Cf. Diomedes (GL 1: 329, 20–22): “*ordo quoque * aut praepositiva sunt, ut quis quantus, aut subiunctiva, ut is tantus: veluti praepositiva, [ut] quis fecit? subiunctiva vel quae responsi vim habent, iste fecit; item quantus ille est, tantus ille est*” and Ps.-Asper (GL 5: 551, 1–3): “*ordo accidit pronominibus: nam aut praepositiva sunt pronomina, ut quis quantus, aut subiunctiva, ut is tantus*.” *Ordo* is more commonly a property of the conjunction (cf. XV, 16–17). See also Schad (2007: s.v. *ordo* 2).

¹⁸ X, 10–11: “*Item aut praepositiva sunt pronomina, ut ‘quis’, aut subiunctiva, ut ‘is’, aut communia, ut ‘talīs, qualis’.*”

¹⁹ 629, 8–9H: “*sunt praepositiva, ut quis, hic; sunt subiunctiva, ut is, idem*.”

²⁰ Priscian (GL 2: 579, 15–22): “*interest autem inter demonstrationem et relationem hoc, quod demonstratio interrogationi reddita primam cognitionem ostendit (quis fecit? ego), relatio vero secundam cognitionem significat: is, de quo iam dixi. iure igitur hic, quod primam cognitionem indicat, praepositur, unde et praepositivum nominatur, is autem, quod secundam cognitionem significat, subiungitur, unde et subiunctivum pro merito nuncupatur, quod redigat in memoriam primae cognitionis, ut si dicam: Aeneas filius fuit Veneris; is est qui vicit Turnum*.”

The treatment of the *pronomina praepositiva* and *pronomina subiunctiva* is very brief in the *APS*, although this is the case also with the discussions in Donatus' *Ars maior* (see n. 19 above) and Ps.-Asper's grammar (see n. 17 above), where only a few examples are given to illustrate this phenomenon. Unlike the other discussions on this issue, which are satisfied with the two aforementioned categories, the *APS* has a third category of pronouns in addition to the more prevalent *pronomina praepositiva* and *subiunctiva*, namely (*pronomina*) *communia*. Presumably the author means by *communia* pronouns that can occur in either part of a sentence, the beginning or the end. The examples for this category are *talis* and *qualis*. These words appear elsewhere only as examples in the passage in Charisius' discussion on the pronoun, where *qualis* would appear to be a *pronomina praepositiva* and *talis* a *pronomina subiunctiva*.²¹ Others, like Diomedes and Ps.-Asper, give *quantus* ('how great?') and *tantus* ('so great'), which closely resemble *qualis* ('what kind?') and *talis* ('such'), as examples of *pronomina praepositiva* and *pronomina subiunctiva*.

On the basis of these examples, it would seem that the author of the *APS* is alone with his views. No other discussion supports his understanding of this issue. Still, we should not, perhaps, consider the manuscript reading "*communia, ut qualis, talis*" (X, 10–11) a corruption or a mistake.²² The author of the *APS* has on several occasions shown an interest in discussing the common number or the common gender when few other grammarians have deemed such a category necessary.²³ The additional category matches this tendency very well. Further support for keeping the additional category can be sought in the very words quoted as examples by the author of the *APS*. *Qualis* and *talis* can indeed be used in the same order as *quantus* and *tantus* were used by Diomedes in his discussion (see n. 17 above), where *quantus*, an interrogative pronoun, must be interpreted as a question and *tantus* as an answer. But *qualis* and *quantus* can also be used in a relative capacity. In that case *qualis* can occur after *talis*, and thus *qualis* and *talis* could be interpreted as common (*communia*) as regards the order in which they appear in a sentence.²⁴

The second property discussed in the *APS* is grammatical gender (*genus*) (X, 12–14). The discussion on gender in pronouns is much shorter than the one in the chapter on the noun, with three and a half lines devoted to gender in pronouns compared to more than ten in nouns. The *APS* is not

²¹ Charisius (205, 1–6B): "*pronomina a nominibus et participiis ita discernimus, si omni percuntationi responsionem suam exhibebimus. nam hoc quasi proprium pronominum est, ut cum dictum sit quis, subiungas hic vel ille, aut cum quas has, aut qualis talis, deinde quantus tantus, mox quot tot.*" We should probably understand "... aut qualis talis" as "... aut (cum dictum sit) qualis, (subiungas) talis" based on the first example a few lines above ("ut cum dictum sit quis, subiungas hic uel ille"). See also (208, 26B): "*praepositiva masculina singulariter quantus quanti quanto...*", and (209, 1B): "*subiunctiva masculina singulariter tantus tanti tanto...*".

²² In the next section, in which gender is discussed, Donatus and Ps.-Probus, for instance, have *qualis* or *talis* as an example of the common gender: "*neutrum, ut quod; commune, ut qualis, talis; trium generum, ut ego, tu*" (630, 5H).

²³ See the discussion on the *numerus communis* in verbs, in chapter 3.8 below.

²⁴ E.g., Cicero *Inv.* 2.58.176: "...ut res non tales, quales ante habitae sint, habendae videantur".

alone among the Late Latin *artes* in referring to the discussion on gender in nouns in the chapter on the pronoun, as, for instance, Donatus and Ps.-Probus do the same.²⁵

The masculine, feminine, and neuter genders are provided with one example each (*quis*, *quae*, and *quod*),²⁶ but the common gender (*genus commune*) receives once again a more thorough discussion than the rest. The author of the *APS* states that gender can be common to two or all three genders. He gives *ego* ('I') as an example for the latter kind; this is by far the most prevalent example for the *genus commune*.²⁷ The pronoun *quae* ('which') is the example for the pronouns common to two genders, that is, the feminine and the neuter gender.²⁸ In the chapter on the noun two kinds of nouns common to two genders were discussed (IX, 70–73).²⁹ Keeping this in mind, the author of the *APS* might have included another example for the pronouns common to two genders, an example of the type *qualis*, which can be either a feminine or a masculine pronoun. However, the discussion on gender in pronouns seems complete, and there is no compelling argument to consider moving the words "*communia, ut qualis, talis*" from the previous discussion to that on gender.

Grammatical number (*numerus*) is discussed next in the *APS*.³⁰ The section on number in the *APS* does not offer anything very original, although this is the case with most Late Latin *artes*.³¹

The brief discussions on composition (*figura*) in pronouns have relatively little variation in the corpus of Late Latin grammars, with most grammarians using exactly the same examples and very similar wording in general.³² The discussion on *figura* in the *APS* is literally similar to that appearing in Dositheus' grammar and the *Ars Bobiensis*, for instance.

The *accidens persona* ('person') receives also rather a brief discussion in the *APS*, but this

²⁵ Donatus (630, 3H): "*Genera pronomini, ita ut nominibus, accidunt paene omnia*" and Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 131, 8–9): "*genera in pronomini sic uti in nominibus considerata sunt*".

²⁶ Most Late Latin grammars give *hic*, *haec*, and *hoc* as examples for the three main genders, but Donatus (630, 3–4H) and the *APS* (X, 13) have *quis*, *quae*, and *quod* instead.

²⁷ When grammarians only distinguish one type of common gender, *ego* (or *ego*, *tu*) is the standard example for the *genus commune*, as, e.g., in the grammars of Charisius (200, 16–17B), Dositheus (27, 10Bo), Audax (GL 7: 343, 18), and the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (40, 6D). When the distinction is made between the *communia duobus generibus* and the *communia tribus generibus* (or the *genus commune* and the *genus omne*), as, for instance, in the *APS* (X, 13–14), Donatus (630, 4–5H), and Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 131, 9–10), *ego* is always the example for the *communia tribus generibus*.

²⁸ *Quae* can be interpreted as the feminine nominative singular or as the neuter nominative (or accusative) plural.

²⁹ Nouns common to two genders were exemplified by the noun *canis*, which can be masculine or feminine, and *magna*, which can be interpreted as either a feminine nominative singular or a neuter nominative (or accusative) plural.

³⁰ X, 15–17: "*Numerus pronomini accedit uterque, singularis, ut 'qualis', pluralis, ut 'quales'. Communis quoque numerus inuenitur, ut 'qui, quae'. Dicimus enim 'qui uir' et 'qui uiri', 'quae mulier' et 'quae mulieres'.*"

³¹ In Ps.-Asper's grammar the discussion on *numerus* (GL 5: 550, 37–551, 1) does, however, contain more material than is usually the case: "*numerus pronomini accedit singularis, ut ego quis, pluralis, ut nos quanti, communis, ut quae quanta. numerus apud Graecos propter dualem numerum motus habet nouem, in sermone nostro quatuor: aut enim unum unius significamus, ut meus tuus, aut multos multorum, ut nostri uestri, aut unum multorum, ut noster uester, aut multos unius, ut mei tui.*" This issue is discussed later on (X, 33–34) in the *APS*.

³² The most common examples here are *quis* and *quisquis* (cf. Donatus (630, 10–11H) and Charisius (200, 17–18B)) and *ego* and *egomet* (cf. Dositheus (27, 11–12Bo) and Ps.-Asper (GL 5: 551, 4)). The *APS* includes all four examples in the discussion on *figura* (X, 18–19).

seems to be in line with most of the shorter Late Antique Latin grammars. The author of the *APS* merely lists the three persons, providing two examples for each person.³³ Some grammarians, like Audax (*GL* 7: 343, 24–25), seek further to explain what is meant by *persona*. Donatus, for instance, adds the specification that person applies to the definite pronouns not the indefinite ones.³⁴

The last *accidens* discussed in the *APS* is case (*casus*). While that property may not attract a long discussion in most Late Latin grammars,³⁵ many of them contain numerous paradigms by way of examples.³⁶ Only the *Ars maior* of Donatus, the grammar of Ps.-Asper, and the *Excerpta* of Audax, in addition to the *APS*, do not include additional paradigms in the chapter on the pronoun. The author of the *APS* does not name the six cases at this point, as he did in the chapter on the noun; he merely lists the singular and plural case forms of the pronoun *hic*, *haec*, *hoc* ('this').³⁷

After having discussed all the properties of the pronoun listed at the beginning of the chapter, the author of the *APS* turns to certain aspects of the pronoun that do not fit into the framework of the *accidentia*.³⁸ First, he flatly states that no pronoun undergoes comparison, regardless of its meaning (X, 25–27). This view is supported by a number of grammarians,³⁹ although most offer no comment on this issue.

This passage has some textual problems. The manuscript reading is the following: "*nullum autem pronomen recipit comparationem quamvis ut qualis talis aut quantitate ut quantus tantus nisi in locum nominis successerit ut pulcher decens fit enim pulchrior*". The sequence "*ut qualis talis; aut quantitate*<*m*>, *ut quantus, tantus*" seems to belong to a discussion a few lines down (X, 29), where information on pronouns signifying quality and quantity should occur. The remaining sentence also needs to be completed; the phrase "*nullum autem pronomen recipit comparationem*"⁴⁰ could stand on its own, but, as it is followed by the conjunction *quamvis* ('albeit'), something has

³³ X, 20–21: "*Personae pronomibus accidunt tres: prima, ut 'ego' uel 'mihi', secunda, ut 'tu' uel 'tibi', tertia, ut 'ille' uel 'sibi'.*"

³⁴ 631, 3–4H: "*Personae finitis pronomibus accidunt tres, prima, ut ego, secunda, ut tu, tertia, ut ille.*" Also Diomedes, Ps.-Probus, and Ps.-Asper include this point in their discussions, whereas Charisius, Dositheus, the *Ars Bobiensis*, Audax, and the *APS* do not.

³⁵ Many grammars refer to the chapter on the noun in their discussions on case in pronouns, as is the case with the *APS*: "*Casus pronomibus ita ut nominibus adiunguntur*" (X, 22). See also Charisius' grammar (200, 21B), the *Ars Bobiensis* (40, 12–13D), and the *Excerpta* of Audax (*GL* 7: 343, 23–24).

³⁶ For instance, the following grammars contain paradigms for numerous pronouns: the grammars of Charisius, Dositheus, Diomedes, and Ps.-Probus, the *Ars breuiata* of Augustine, the *Ars minor* of Donatus, and the *Ars Bobiensis*.

³⁷ X, 22–24: "*Casus pronomibus ita ut nominibus adiunguntur, ut 'hic uel haec uel hoc, huius, huic, hunc, hanc uel hoc, o, ab hoc et ab hac'; et pluraliter: 'hi uel hae uel haec, horum, harum, his, hos, has, haec, o, ab his'.*"

³⁸ The following material (X, 25ff.) is not discussed in the framework of the *accidentia* in the *APS*. Other grammarians did, however, discuss material appearing at the end of the chapter on the pronoun in the *APS* as a separate property. Cf., e.g., meaning (*significatio*) in the grammar of Ps.-Asper (n. 44 below) with X, 27–32.

³⁹ Donatus remarks on this issue in the *Ars maior* (631, 10–11H). Also Cledonius (*GL* 5: 51, 26–28) and Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 500, 2–4; 548, 7–8) mention comparison in pronouns in their commentaries.

⁴⁰ "No pronoun undergoes comparison."

probably been omitted from the text. A few other passages on comparison in pronouns can, perhaps, help us restore this confusing passage. A passage from Donatus' *Ars maior* is very similar to the one in the *APS*: "*Nullum autem pronomen recipit comparationem, quamuis et qualitatem significet et quantitatem.*"⁴¹ In fact, the wording is so similar in these two passages that an emendation to the *APS* has been made based on these lines.

The following lines (X, 26–27) are also somewhat problematic. The manuscript reading goes against the opinion held by other grammarians commenting on this issue;⁴² thus an emendation is required for the conjunction *nisi* ('unless').

What follows is a list of different pronouns classed in terms of their meaning (X, 27–32).⁴³ Meaning in pronouns is discussed by several Late Latin grammarians, but only one grammar, that of Ps.-Asper, organizes this material into the framework of the *accidentia*.⁴⁴ The other grammarians who raise this issue are content with discussing it in a less systematic manner. Donatus, for instance, inserts his discussion on meaning, along with other miscellaneous material, between the discussions on *qualitas* and *genus*. Audax, like the author of the *APS* and Diomedes,⁴⁵ places it toward the end of his chapter on the pronoun, after treating the six *accidentia*. Many grammars, like those of the Charisius group, do not include such information in their works at all.⁴⁶

The manuscript reading *audientem* has been emended to *aut gentem* (X, 28), which is more in line with the content of the passage. The pronouns signifying quality and quantity are missing altogether from the passage on meaning, having been misplaced in the discussion on comparison in pronouns (cf. X, 26). The information on these pronouns has been placed after the pronouns signifying number in this discussion, as pronouns signifying quality and quantity usually appear toward the end in other similar lists, often immediately before the *pronomina ad aliquid*.⁴⁷ The

⁴¹ 631, 10–11H: "No pronoun undergoes comparison, even though it should signify quality and quantity."

⁴² Cf., e.g., Cledonius (*GL* 5: 51, 27–28): "*quia nullum pronomen recipit comparationem. neque enim potest dici qualior talior, quo modo suauior dulcior.*"

⁴³ X, 27–32: "*Nam aut rem significat, ut 'hoc, illud'; aut gentem, ut 'cuias, nostras'; aut ordinem, ut 'quotus, totus'; aut numerum, ut 'quot, tot'; <aut qualitatem, ut 'qualis, talis'; aut quantitatem, ut 'quantus, tantus'; > aut <ad> aliquid dictum, quod apud Graecos τὸν πρὸς τί <dictum est ex his quae ad aliquid referuntur, > ut 'meus, tuus', quae non sola fcomparari in nominibus† <***> [dictum est ex his quae ad aliquid feruntur].*"

⁴⁴ Ps.-Asper discusses this subject under *significatio* (meaning), which is one of the nine *accidentia* of the pronoun included in his grammar. See *GL* 5: 550, 28–35: "*significatio pronominum in octo partes divisa est: aut enim personam significant, ut quis quae, aut rem, ut hoc istud, aut gentem, ut cuias nostras, aut numerum, ut quot tot, aut ordinem, ut quotus totus, aut qualitatem, ut qualis talis, aut quantitatem, ut quantus tantus, aut ad aliquid; quorum quaedam aut utraque singularia sunt, ut meus tuus, aut utraque pluralia, ut nostri vestri, aut extrinsecus singularia, ut noster vester, aut intrinsecus pluralia, ut mei tui.*"

⁴⁵ Diomedes first discusses six properties, then turns to this issue, leaving the last property (*casus*) and the paradigms of the various pronouns to the very end of his chapter.

⁴⁶ Only the *pronomina ad aliquid* are mentioned by Charisius, Dositheus, and the *Anonymus Bobiensis*.

⁴⁷ This is the case with the discussions appearing in the grammars of Diomedes (*GL* 1: 329, 24–25), Audax (*GL* 7: 343, 27–28), and Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 550, 31–32).

material that should follow the phrase *τὼν πρὸς τί* (X, 30) has been misplaced to the end of this passage (cf. X, 31–32). The emended sentence runs as follows (X, 29–31): “*aut <ad> aliquid dictum, quod apud Graecos τὼν πρὸς τί <dictum est ex his quae ad aliquid referuntur,> ut meus, tuus*”.⁴⁸ The last part of this discussion has also suffered corruption, as the manuscript reading seems inexplicable: “*quod non sola comparari in nominibus*”. At the moment, I cannot offer any plausible emendation to these words, and the phrase has been marked as corrupt in the text.

The next lines (X, 33–34) are connected to the *pronomina ad aliquid*; this is not clearly stated in the *APS*, unlike in the grammar of Charisius,⁴⁹ for instance, but the passage immediately follows the discussion on these pronouns. Many Late Latin grammarians discuss possessive pronouns, but the terminology in these accounts often diverges from the terminology used in the *APS* (e.g., Charisius, n. 49). In terms of terminology, the discussion in Donatus’ *Ars maior* is the closest to the passage in the *APS*.⁵⁰

The last lines in the chapter on the pronoun are subject to considerable textual problems. At issue seems to be the fact that some pronouns can be confused with adverbs, but the end of this passage is incomprehensible in the form in which it has been transmitted to us.⁵¹ It is very possible that we are missing some of the text. References to confusion existing between pronouns and adverbs are few in the corpus of Late Latin grammars. Furthermore, none of these passages are close enough in their content or wording to be of use in trying to reconstruct these lines. The grammars of the Charisius group, for instance, include only a rather vague statement on the matter, with no examples or further explanation.⁵² Also, Priscian mentions adverbs a few times in his chapter on the pronoun (e.g., *GL* 2: 593, 26–594, 1), but his discussion is incompatible with the one in the *APS*. Professor De Nonno helpfully suggests that the words *qui potuit* (X, 35) can actually be interpreted as an example for pronouns that can be confused with adverbs, as the form *qui* can be interpreted as a nominative (and thus a pronoun) or an ablative (and thus an adverb).

⁴⁸ “Or it can be relative to something, which is called *τὼν πρὸς τί* by the Greeks, who thus say of those words that are in relation to something, like *meus* (my), *tuus* (your).”

⁴⁹ 205, 7–11B: “*Quaedam pronomina ad aliquid pronuntiantur et utraque significatione singularia sunt, ut meus tuus; aut utraque pluralia, ut nostri vestri; aut intrinsecus pluralia extrinsecus singularia, ut noster vester; aut intrinsecus singularia extrinsecus pluralia, ut mei tui.*”

⁵⁰ 630, 8–9H: “*Sunt pronomina tota singularia, ut meus, tuus; tota pluralia, ut nostri, uestri; ex parte singularia, ut mei, tui; ex parte pluralia, ut noster, uester.*”

⁵¹ X, 35–36: “*Quaedam pronomina confunduntur cum aduerbiis, ut ‘qui potuit’ cum dicimus fīta ut nomina quaeque dicimus curae est cordi est mihi*”.

⁵² “*Ex his pronominibus aliquot sunt quae adverbialiter quodam modo intelleguntur*” in Charisius (203, 8–9B), Dositheus (32, 1–2Bo), and the *Ars Bobiensis* (46, 12–13D).

3.8 De uerbo

The chapter on the verb in the *APS* begins with the definition. The definition of the verb shows a great deal of variation in the corpus of Late Latin grammars. The new, essential definition of the verb was not based on the earlier, etymological definition, which was already mentioned in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*.¹ The essential definition assigns to the verb the capacity of signifying action and undergoing action as the characteristic which separates it from the other parts of speech.² The essential definition of the verb took longer to establish itself than the essential definition of the noun (Luhtala 2002: 279). Also, it seems never to have been as widely used as that of the noun. Among Late Latin grammars, this type of definition is found in the works of Sacerdos, Consentius, Charisius, Ps.-Asper, Audax, Priscian, and Donatus.³

In the *APS*, however, the author has not used a definition similar to the ones appearing in the works listed above. Instead, he defines the verb using only formal features: "*Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu*" (XI, 3).⁴ The verb is the only word class that the author of the *APS* defines in this manner. He is not alone, however, in using this type of definition of the verb; a similar definition is found in the *Ars breuiata* of Augustine, for instance.⁵ Also, Diomedes has a definition based on formal features at the beginning of his treatment of the verb. But Diomedes, unlike Augustine and the author of the *APS*, is not content with the formal definition alone; immediately afterward, he includes also an etymological definition.⁶ Ps.-Probus uses one of

¹ *Inst.* 1.6.34: "*et verba ab aëre verberato*." Later on, this etymological definition appears in many grammars, e.g., in Sacerdos' work ("*verbum autem dicitur, quod verberato aëre fiat*," *GL* 6: 429, 18–19), often along with the more recent, essential definition. Also, the commentators of Donatus often mention the etymological definition of the verb in their discussions (cf. Pompey, *GL* 5: 212, 6ff.), although Donatus had left such definitions out of his treatise.

² Cf. Donatus, *Ars maior* (632, 5–6H): "*Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu aut agere aliquid aut pati aut neutrum significans*."

³ Cf. Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 429, 15–16): "*Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu, qua quid agatur vel actum agendumve sit indicatur*", Charisius (209, 24–25B): "*Verbum est pars orationis administrationem rei significans cum tempore et persona numerisque carens casu*", Consentius (*GL* 5: 365, 29–366, 1): "*Verbum est pars orationis factum aliquod habitumve significans cum tempore et persona sine casu. factum quod significatur agentis aut patientis vim continet: agentis, ut seco uro; patientis, ut secor uror...*", Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 551, 11–12): "*Verbum est pars orationis actum aut passivatem cum tempore et persona significans*", Audax (*GL* 7: 344, 9–10): "*Verbum quid est? pars orationis cum persona et tempore agentem patientemque significans*", and Priscian: "*Verbum est pars orationis cum temporibus et modis, sine casu, agendi vel patiendi significativum*" (*GL* 2: 369, 2–3).

⁴ "The verb is a part of speech with a tense and person but without a case."

⁵ *IV* § 1W: "*Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu*." According to Anneli Luhtala (2005: 141), the grammar of Augustine, although it post-dates Donatus' works, was not influenced by the so-called post-Apollonian renovation of grammar. This can be seen in the definitions of the noun, the pronoun, and the verb, as well as in the lack of the semantic subcategories of the noun (2005: 141). The *APS* and the *Ars breuiata* have similar definitions for the pronoun and the verb, but the author of the *APS* integrates some of the semantic subtypes of the noun into his grammar; he also knows the standard definition of the noun as signifying abstract or concrete things commonly or properly.

⁶ *GL* 1: 334, 2–6: "*Verbum est pars orationis praecipua sine casu. etenim haec universae orationi uberes praebet ad facultatem vires. cuius operae pretium est penitus intueri potestatem, ne inscitia vitiosum exerceamus sermonem. vis*

his truncated definitions also in the section on the verb.⁷ Some grammarians, like Victorinus and Dositheus, fail to define the verb at all. Although some commentators of Donatus, like Pompey or Julian of Toledo, discuss his definition of the verb, some do not focus on Donatus' definition and, instead, prefer to quote etymological or formal definitions of the verb. For instance, Servius and the compiler of the first book of the *Explanationes* include a definition very similar to the one appearing in the *APS* in their commentaries.⁸

Next, the author of the *APS* lists the properties of the verb.⁹ The manuscript text only contains seven properties, but I am inclined to add to the list the *accidens genus*, as this property is discussed later on in the chapter (XI, 9–16). Also, every grammarian who lists the *accidentia* includes *genus* in his catalogue;¹⁰ thus it is very plausible that an omission might have occurred in the list. The *accidentia* of the verb in the *APS* would then number eight, as in the grammars of Charisius, Diomedes, and Priscian.¹¹

The first property discussed by the author is *qualitas*. In this grammar *qualitas* is divided into *qualitas finita* and *qualitas infinita*, that is, into finite and infinite verb forms (XI, 5–8). The same approach, with wording closely resembling the discussion here, can also be found in a few other Late Latin grammars: namely the grammars of Charisius, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, Victorinus,¹² and Consentius.¹³ The division of *qualitas* into *finita* and *infinita* appears also in Sacerdos' grammar, but the wording of that passage is different from that of the *APS*.¹⁴

In many Late Antique Latin grammars the property *qualitas* is, confusingly, a very different

igitur huius temporibus et personis administratur. verbum autem dictum est ab eo quod verberato lingua intra palatum aere omnis oratio promatur."

⁷ Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 155, 34): "*Verbum est pars orationis.*" Cf. the discussion on p. 144 n. 2 above.

⁸ The *Commentum in Donatum* of Servius and the first book of the *Explanationes* discuss definitions that are very similar to the one used in the *APS*: "*Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu*" (Servius, GL 4: 411, 14) and "*Verbum est pars orationis, quae habet tempus et personam sine casu, ut si dicas lego scribo meditor*" (Ps.-Sergius, GL 4: 502, 26–27).

⁹ XI, 3–4: "*Verbo accidunt qualitas, <genus,> modus, numerus, figura, coniugatio, persona, tempus.*"

¹⁰ Typically, the term *genus* is used to signify verbal diathesis, but sometimes also other terms are suggested, as in Diomedes' work ("*significationem sive genus*" GL 1: 334, 12). Ps.-Asper uses only the term *significatio* (GL 5: 551, 12).

¹¹ These three grammars do not, however, all contain a similar list of the *accidentia* of the verb; only the number of properties is the same. Other grammarians may list a diverging number properties; for instance, Donatus' list lacks *modus*, which he considers a subcategory of *qualitas*, whereas others, such as Sacerdos and Ps.-Probus, have a list of nine properties, including *accidentia* like *forma* or *accentus*.

¹² See Charisius (209, 28–210, 2B), the *Ars Bobiensis* (47, 11–17D), and Victorinus (GL 6: 197, 24–198, 3).

¹³ See GL 5: 374, 1–3. Unlike the grammars of Charisius, Victorinus, and the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, which leave off their treatment of *qualitas* at this, Consentius' work includes also the moods and the forms of the verb under the *accidens qualitas* (GL 5: 374, 13ff.): "*his positis intellegimus utique in modis positam qualitatem esse verborum. hi modi licet a quibusdam varie numerentur... Item verborum latinorum qualitas ... consideratur in formis, quas formas quidam generibus vel significationibus prave adplicant.*" He seems to have, in effect, combined Donatus' method (which divides *qualitas* into moods and forms) with another system, where *qualitas* contains the division into *finita* and *infinita*.

¹⁴ GL 6: 429, 25–26: "*qualitas in verbis aut finita est, ut amo, aut infinita, ut amare.*"

type of category. Some grammarians list under this heading the derivational formations of verbs and other formal subtypes (often called *formae*), as is the case with Diomedes' grammar, which lists altogether eight such forms,¹⁵ and Dositheus' grammar, which lists four.¹⁶ Furthermore, Donatus adopts a system in which *qualitas* covers both the moods and the *formae*.¹⁷ This system was later adopted by other grammarians, such as Consentius (see n. 13 above) and the commentators of Donatus.

Next, the author of the *APS* discusses the *accidens genus* ('verbal voice'). The system employed in this grammar divides the verbal voice into five subcategories: active, passive, neuter, common, and deponent (XI, 9–16). This is the most common division of *genus*,¹⁸ and it is the one used by Donatus and Priscian, for instance. Other divisions are also attested in Late Antique Latin grammars; Charisius, for example, includes four different accounts of verbal voice in his chapter on the verb. One of these passages (214, 26–215, 17B) contains the most common division of verbal voice into five subcategories; another passage adds the impersonal¹⁹ to these five as the sixth *genus* (210, 3–8B). Another account first lists four *genera* (*agens*, *patiens*, *commune*, and *neutrum*), then adding a fifth, the deponent (210, 9–211, 3B).²⁰ Finally, a rather unique solution for verbal voice (211, 25–213, 28B) contains only three *genera* (*activum*, *passivum*, and *habitivum*). Sacerdos and Ps.-Probus offer interesting interpretations of *genus*, as they combine both inflectional and derivational or formal categories under that heading.²¹ Hovdhaugen (1986: 320 n. 2) considers this lack of distinction between inflection and derivation a remnant of an earlier stage in Roman linguistics.

In the discussion on verbal voice (XI, 9–16), the author of the *APS* uses almost exclusively inflectional criteria in distinguishing between the voices. Only once does he rely on a semantic

¹⁵ *GL* 1: 342, 29–31: "*Qualitates verborum sunt hae, absoluta sive perfecta, inchoativa, iterativa sive frequentativa, meditativa, transgressiva, defectiva, supina, ambigua.*"

¹⁶ 34, 2–7Bo: "*Qualitas uerborum in quot est formis? IIII: absoluta, ut lego; meditativa, ut lecturio; frequentativa, ut lectito; inchoativa, ut feruesco, calesco.*"

¹⁷ See the discussion in *Ars maior*: "*qualitas uerborum in modis est et in formis. modi autem sunt, ut multi existimant, septem: indicatiuus..., imperativus..., promissivus..., optativus..., coniunctivus..., infinitivus..., impersonalis...*" (632, 8–11H) and "*qualitas uerborum etiam in formis est constituta, quas formas alii uerborum generibus uel significationibus admiscunt. formae igitur sunt quattuor: perfecta, meditativa, frequentativa, inchoativa.*" (633, 5–7H).

¹⁸ See Schad (2007: s.v. *genus* 3).

¹⁹ Thus Charisius (or rather one of his sources) considers impersonal verbs to be a subcategory of *genus*. Also Diomedes (*GL* 1: 336, 24) and the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (47, 18–19D) do the same. Impersonal verbs were more often included among the *modi* than the *genera* in Late Antique Latin grammars (see Schad 2007: s.v. *impersonalis*). Other suggestions were also put forward for classifying impersonal verbs: e.g., *figura* (by Ps.-Asper, *GL* 5: 551, 23) and *forma* (by Sacerdos, *GL* 6: 429, 20).

²⁰ 211, 4–5B: "*Etiam quantum genus verborum alii dixerunt, simplex vel deponens de quo dicendum est.*"

²¹ Cf. Sacerdos (*GL* 4: 156, 10–12): "*Genus in verbis, id est species vel adfectus vel significatio, dividitur in novem, activum passivum deponens neutrum commune inchoativum defectivum frequentativum impersonale*" (*GL* 6: 429, 27–29) and Ps.-Probus: "*De genere sive qualitate. genus sive qualitas verborum octo his significationibus intellegitur, id est activa passiva neutrali deponenti communi inchoativa frequentativa defectiva*".

argument: to distinguish the *genus commune* from the deponent verbs, he assigns it the particular characteristic of having both an active and a passive meaning.²² In his approach the author aligns himself with, for example, Donatus, whose account of the verbal voice (635, 5–636, 5H) is very similar in its scope.²³

Hovdhaugen perceives a progression in the discussions on *genus* in Late Latin grammars from the early confusion as to what should be included in that category (see Ps.-Probus and Sacerdos, n. 21) to treatments based on mostly inflectional criteria²⁴ and, further, to analyses of a rather more philosophical nature, where the semantics of the *genera* are investigated (1986: 315–316).²⁵ His argument finds support in the sources, but the picture is not perfectly clear on this matter.²⁶ Ultimately, Hovdhaugen sees the advancement in the descriptions of verbal voice from the third to the sixth century AD as a part of a general trend in Roman linguistics, arguing against Barwick’s view of Late Antiquity as an arid period in linguistics, when grammarians were merely content to repeat the teachings of centuries long past (Hovdhaugen 1986: 319).

What is usually termed *genus deponens* is called also *genus simplex* in the *APS*. The term must be understood, according to Schad, as referring to the fact that deponent verbs are “used absolutely” (2007: s.v. *simplex* 3) – that is, on their own.²⁷ The use of this alternative term is not confined to this grammar; it is found in also in the grammars of Charisius (211, 4–5B) and Priscian,

²² XI, 13–15: “Commune est quod ‘r’ littera terminatur et utriusque uerbi significationem habet, ut *criminator*, *consolor*: dicimus enim ‘*criminator te*’ et ‘*criminator a te*’, ‘*consolor te*’ et ‘*consolor a te*’.”

²³ The scale, if not the wording, of these two passages is very similar. A digression on the part of Donatus on various types of neuter verbs (such as *odi*, *sum*, and *pudet*) is the main difference between these two discussions on verbal *genera*.

²⁴ At this end of the spectrum, there are treatments like the one appearing in Charisius’ grammar (210, 3–6B), in which no arguments of a semantic nature are taken into account: “*Verborum genera sunt quinque, activum, ut lego scribo, passivum, ut legor scribor, neutrum, ut sedeo curro, commune, ut adolor criminator, deponens, luctor convivor.*”

²⁵ Hovdhaugen (1986: 315) quotes Pompey as an example of the more advanced treatments of verbal voice: “*quicquid est in toto mundo, aut patitur aut agit sine dubio: quaere omnes res, et inuenies quod coguntur nescio qua ratione aut pati aut certe ipsae agere. curre per illa genera, et inuenies ita esse verbum. ecce lego: lego agentis est significatio, legor passivum est, et tamen et agentis est significatio. nato unde est? a neutrali est, et tamen agentis est. ... vapulo neutrale est, et tamen patientis est; ab alio enim vapulo. ita luctor, loquor, ista similia deponentia dicuntur omnia, et tamen significationem habent agentis. ergo quodcumque est verbum, necesse est ut in has cadat significationes, ut omne verbum aut agentis sit aut patientis, licet aliud habeat genus*” (GL 5: 213, 25–35).

²⁶ The early fourth-century *Instituta artium* describes *genera* in terms of formal criteria, while the most developed descriptions are late (by Priscian, Phocas, and Pompey). However, Sacerdos’ (late 3rd cent.) discussion already seems to have aspects that mirror those in, e.g., Pompey’s account (see the previous note): “*deponens aut agentis tantum modo continet intellectum, ut luctor, aut patientis, ut labor; ... inter neutram speciem et activam hoc est, quod neutra interdum agentis habet intellectum, ut ambulo sedeo, interdum patientis, pendeo vapulo; activa vero semper agentis continet sensum, patientis numquam*” (GL 6: 430, 14–18).

²⁷ The terms *simplex* and *absoluta* are used by Priscian to describe deponent verbs (see the next note). More often Priscian refers to neuter verbs with the term *absolutus*, as these verbs are self-sufficient and require no object complement (Schad 2007: s.v. *absolutus* 1. iv).

for instance.²⁸

There is an emendation on line 10, where I have changed the manuscript reading *simile* to *simplex*, which is more in line with the content of the passage.

Verbal moods are discussed immediately after the voices of the verb. The author of the *APS* lists seven moods, providing each mood with an example (XI, 17–23). Only the last item in this list, the impersonal mood, receives additional commentary.²⁹ Unlike the author of the *APS*, who does not question the status of any of the moods he includes in his list, many grammarians argue against the inclusion of some of the moods listed here. The status of five of the moods is never questioned in Late Antique Latin grammars, while the status of the *promissivus modus* and the *impersonalis modus* is challenged by many grammarians. The moods that all grammarians agree on are the following: the indicative,³⁰ the imperative, the optative, the subjunctive,³¹ and the infinitive.³² The grammarians who list only these five moods are Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 432, 18–32), Charisius (215, 31–216, 3B), Dositheus (34, 7–12Bo), Consentius (*GL* 5: 374, 14–18), and Priscian (*GL* 2: 421, 18ff.). Donatus lists seven moods, adding to the aforementioned five moods the impersonal mood and the *promissivus modus*, but he then immediately rejects the *promissivus modus*,³³ recognizing thus a total of six moods. Charisius (214, 3–5B), the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (48, 22–49, 10D), Audax (*GL* 7: 344, 13ff.), and the *APS* have seven moods, the five aforementioned moods as well as the *promissivus* and the *impersonalis*. Diomedes, after giving his reader a brief description of the general situation regarding the number of moods, lists the customary five moods, but afterward he adds also the *impersonalis* and the *participialis modus* (*GL* 1: 338, 6–15; 341, 20ff.). Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 155, 39–156, 3) and Servius (*GL* 4: 411, 26–28) list eight moods, adding to the five the *promissivus*, the *impersonalis*, and the *gerundi*. However, after listing them, Servius (*GL* 4: 411, 28ff.) states that the three are considered dubious (“*de tribus vero dubitatur*”). Finally, Victorinus (*GL* 6: 199, 17–19) has a list containing a total of 11 moods.³⁴

The information the author of the *APS* adds to his discussion on *modi*, concerning the different forms of the impersonal mood (XI, 21–23), can be found, almost word for word, in

²⁸ Priscian (*GL* 2: 374, 4–8): “... *deponentem, quae cum similem habeat communibus positionem in or desinendi, tamen deponens vocatur, quasi simplex et absoluta, quod per se ponitur, vel quae deponit alteram significationem et unam per se tenet, quomodo positivus gradus dicitur, qui absolutus per se ponitur non egens alterius coniunctione.*”

²⁹ XI, 21–23: “*Praeter haec sunt alia, ut ‘sedetur, itur, uidetur’. Non [pro] minus et illa apud quosdam impersonalia dicuntur, ut ‘taedet, pudet, paenitet’.*”

³⁰ The indicative is also called *pronuntiativus*, *finitivus*, or *definitivus*.

³¹ The subjunctive mood is most often referred to as *coniunctivus*, but also the terms *subiunctivus* or *adiunctivus* occur.

³² The infinitive is usually called *infinitus* or *infinitivus*, but also *perpetuus* is attested (e.g., Charisius 214, 5B).

³³ 632, 9–10H: “...*promissivus, ut ‘legam’: sed hunc nos modum non accipimus: optativus...*”

³⁴ Victorinus: “*Modi verborum quot sunt? Decem. Qui sunt? Indicativus, imperativus, promissivus, optativus, coniunctivus, concessivus, infinitivus, impersonalis, gerendi, hortandi. addunt quidam percunctativum.*”

Charisius' grammar (210, 6–8B).³⁵ In that passage, however, Charisius is discussing verbal voice (*genus*). Impersonal verbs are classed as a subcategory of *genus* in that passage (cf. n. 19 above), whereas in the *APS* the same information occurs in the discussion on moods, with the impersonal as one of the seven moods.

The infinitive mood, which is called *infinitivus* by Donatus (632, 11H) and Dositheus (34, 11Bo), is called *infinitus* in the *APS*. The term *infinitum* occurs already in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (9.3.9).³⁶ Sacerdos seems to use the term *modus infinitus* consistently (cf. *GL* 6: 432, 30; 433, 34–35, etc.), as does Ps.-Probus (e.g., *GL* 4: 156, 2; 160, 26); thus two of the earliest grammars transmitted to us in any significant length use the term *infinitus*, like the *APS*. This usage may point to a relatively early date for the *APS*.

Many grammarians give the indicative mood additional names, such as *pronuntiatiuus* or *finitivus*, in their discussion on mood.³⁷ In the discussion on mood in the *APS*, only *indicatiuus* is used, but, at the end of the chapter on the verb, the term *pronuntiatiuus modus* is used instead of *indicatiuus*. This may suggest a different source for these two sections.³⁸

The textual emendations in this section are rather uncomplicated. There are two on line 22, where the preposition *pro*³⁹ has been deleted and the manuscript reading *item* has been changed to *itur*. Both of these words can be abbreviated with *it̄*, which, perhaps, explains the confusion in the manuscript. The verb form *itur* appears as an example in discussions on impersonal verbs also elsewhere, for instance, in Sacerdos' grammar (*GL* 6: 429, 24; 431, 25) as well as in a passage in Charisius' work (see n. 35). The emendation on line 21, that is, correcting the manuscript reading *participio* to *passiuo*,⁴⁰ may seem more of a leap, but a scribal error caused by some unfamiliar abbreviation might account for the appearance of *participio* instead of the original *passiuo*. This emendation finds some support in Sacerdos' work (*GL* 6: 431, 28–32), where the author is discussing the impersonal *species*.⁴¹ He points out that the impersonals ending in *-tur* are formed

³⁵ Charisius (210, 6–8B): “*Praeterea sunt et impersonalia, ut sedetur, itur, uidetur. non minus et illa impersonalia dicuntur, ut taedet, pudet, paenitet.*”

³⁶ Quintilian, however, speaks of *infinitum uerbum*, not *modus infinitus*, like the later grammarians. Barwick argued (1922: 130–131) that also Remmius Palaemon used *infinitus* for the infinitive in his grammar, but, as his arguments are somewhat circular in their nature, we cannot take all his conclusions at face value. See also Schad (2007: s.v. *infinitus* 2 iii).

³⁷ E.g., Donatus' *Ars maior* (632, 9H), Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 432, 18–19), and Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 155, 39–156, 1).

³⁸ Cf. XI, 17–23 and XI, 59–62.

³⁹ The preposition (or prefix) *pro* appears a few of times in the preceding lines (*promissiuus* on lines 19 and 18), which might account for its abrupt appearance in the manuscript text at this point.

⁴⁰ I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Docent Anneli Luhtala, for suggesting this emendation to me.

⁴¹ Sacerdos: “*Hoc tamen scire debemus, quod impersonalis species tur quidem terminata sic figuratur, quasi a tertia persona numeri singularis verbi passivi additis personis omnibus utriusque numeri veniat, ut itur a me a te ab illo a nobis a vobis ab illis, quamvis non dicatur eor iris.*” Sacerdos includes under the heading *genus/species* the five voices

like the third-person singular passive verb forms, with the relevant persons then added to the verb with the help of pronouns, as in *itur a me* ('I go').

Verbal number is treated rather briefly in most Late Antique Latin grammars, with some grammars even neglecting to mention it at all (e.g., Dositheus) and some dismissing the subject with a reference to the discussion in the chapter on the noun. All grammarians treating the subject mention the singular and the plural number,⁴² and many, mostly the authors of the longer treatises, also discuss the dual number.

The dual number is not discussed in the *APS*, but something called the common number is included in the discussion: "*Sunt etiam numero communia, ut 'legere, facere', quae similiter et in personis communia sunt*" (XI, 25–26).⁴³ In addition to this grammar, only the *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus⁴⁴ and the first book of the *Explanationes*⁴⁵ mention the common number in conjunction with the verb. The author of the *APS* uses *legere* and *facere* to exemplify verbs of common number. Ps.-Probus does not offer any examples,⁴⁶ but Ps.-Sergius gives *legere* as an example of the common number in verbs. However, the editor of the *Explanationes*, Heinrich Keil, regards the reference to the common number as inauthentic (see n. 45). To me it seems that the manuscript reading should be accepted, based on the similar doctrine occurring in the *APS*.

Most of the passages where the compiler of the *Explanationes* has used the *APS* as his source are in the second book, with the exception of some quotations occurring in the preface to the first book.⁴⁷ The mention of the common number could point to some kind of a connection between *Explanationes I* and the *APS*. However, no mention is made of the specific source for this information in the *Explanationes*,⁴⁸ and the wording of the two passages is different. This is in contrast to the quotations of the *APS* appearing in the second book of the *Explanationes*, which are

of the verb, two derivational formations of the verb (the inchoative and frequentative verbs), defective verbs, and impersonal verbs.

⁴² The examples used most commonly for the two numbers are *lego/legimus* (in the grammars of Donatus, Audax, Ps.-Asper, Cledonius, Consentius, Priscianus, Victorinus, Pompey, and Ps.-Sergius) and *scribo/scribimus* (in the grammars of Charisius, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, and the *APS*). Sacerdos has *amo/amamus*, and Diomedes and Ps.-Probus offer no examples.

⁴³ "There are verbs of common number as well, such as *legere* (to read) or *facere* (to do), which are also common in terms of person."

⁴⁴ *GL* 4: 156, 5–7: "*De numero. numeri verborum sunt tres, singularis pluralis communis. nunc hi, quem ad modum verbis deserviant, in declinatione probantur*". This passage appears in the discussion on number in Schad's *Lexicon* (2007: s.v. *numerus* I.iv).

⁴⁵ *GL* 4: 507, 32–33: "*Numeri verbis idem accidunt, qui et nominibus, singularis ut lego, pluralis ut legimus [addunt quidam communem, ut legere]*." This instance is not mentioned in the *Lexicon* of Schad (cf. the previous note).

⁴⁶ This omission makes it harder for the reader to know for certain what Ps.-Probus refers to with *numerus communis* in conjunction with the verb. Infinite verb forms, however, seem the obvious choice for this category. Later on in his treatise, Ps.-Probus refers to infinite verb forms with the words "*numerus et personis confusus*" (*GL* 4: 160, 26), but this does not preclude us from identifying infinite verb forms also as verbs with a *numerus communis*.

⁴⁷ For more discussion on this topic, see the discussion in chapter 1.1 and 1.4 above.

⁴⁸ See n. 45 above.

usually very close to their source in their wording.

It is clear from this section (XI, 25–26) that verbs of common number are infinite verb forms. Infinite verb forms have been mentioned twice already in the section on the verb in the *APS*, briefly on line 21,⁴⁹ where the verbal moods were listed, and on lines 5–8,⁵⁰ where the *accidens qualitas* was discussed. On lines 5–8 infinite verb forms are described as being indefinite in terms of tenses, persons, and numbers, whereas on lines 25–26 they are described as being common in terms of number and person. The common number is included in the discussion on *numerus* in the sections on the noun (IX, 78), the pronoun (X, 16–17), and the verb.⁵¹ The fact that one phenomenon, in this case infinite verb forms, is discussed more than once is rather a rare occurrence in the *APS*. The *APS*, as a relatively short work, naturally contains much less information than the larger compilations of Charisius or Diomedes, for example, and the author of the *APS*, like Donatus, sought to create a unified work with no great discrepancies in the doctrine it presents.

Common number features often in conjunction with the noun and the pronoun, but common number in verbs is discussed in few grammars, with most grammarians never mentioning common number in verbs at all. Priscian even specifically speaks against such a thing,⁵² but he seems to be referring to finite verb forms only. One further topic is discussed under the heading *numerus* (‘number’) in the *APS*. The issue in question is what we would term frequentative verbs, although they are not labelled as such in this grammar.⁵³ In the *APS*, frequentative verbs⁵⁴ are treated within the system of the *accidentia*, under the heading *numerus*.⁵⁵ This is a unique solution among Late Antique Latin grammars; more often frequentative verbs, along with other derivational formations of the verb, are treated within the *accidens qualitas*, which covered the moods (*modi*) and the

⁴⁹ XI, 21: “... infinitus, ut ‘legere’”.

⁵⁰ XI, 6–8: “infinita est quae minime certum habet, ut ‘legere, scribere’. Haec enim omnibus numeris, temporibus, personis infinita sunt.”

⁵¹ In the chapter on the noun (IX, 78), the author uses the phrase “sunt utriusque numeri [sc. nomina]” to describe nouns that are common in terms of number, whereas in the chapter on the pronoun (X, 16–17) and that on the verb (XI, 25–26) the term *numerus communis* (or *numero communis*) is used instead. Ps.-Probus mentions common number in all of his discussions on the inflecting parts of speech, that is, in the chapter on the noun (GL 4: 74, 22–31), the pronoun (GL 4: 131, 17–18), the verb (GL 4: 156, 5–7), as well as the participle (GL 4: 139, 37–38).

⁵² GL 2: 451, 5–12: “Sciendum tamen, quod, quamvis et in nominibus et pronominibus et in participiis inveniantur voces communes singularis et pluralis numeri (ut poetae, viri, fluctus ...), in verbo numquam hoc invenitur apud Latinos, quamvis apud Graecos in multis, ut ἑνπρον tam singulare est primae personae quam plurale tertiae praeteriti imperfecti”.

⁵³ XI, 26–27: “Item aut semel quid factum uerba significant, ut ‘lego’, aut saepius, ut ‘lecto’, aut semper, ut ‘lectito’.”

⁵⁴ The frequentative verb is the only derivational formation discussed within the system of the *accidentia* in the *APS*; the inchoative verb is discussed in a separate section at the end of the chapter on the verb, whereas the meditative verb does not receive any comment whatsoever.

⁵⁵ The placement of this passage could also have been considered merely accidental; however, in the section on the participle, a similar mention of this phenomenon appears in the discussion on number, ruling out this possibility: “Numeri participiis accidunt duo: singularis, ut ‘hic currens’, pluralis, ut ‘hi currentes’. Item aut semel quid agi participia significant, ut ‘legens, currens’, aut saepius, ut ‘lectitans, cursitans’” (XII, 22–24).

derivational formations (*formae*) of the verb. This is the solution used by Donatus, and after him many other grammarians follow suit. The slightly earlier grammars of Sacerdos and Ps.-Probus opt for a solution where the derivational formations are placed under the heading *genus* or *significatio*, along with the voices of the verb. Diomedes' and Ps.-Asper's grammars make form the primary element in grouping these derivational formations (Law 1990: 92–93). Diomedes forms the category of *qualitas*, containing eight members, while Ps.-Asper uses the familiar category of *figura* ('composition') to embrace the derivational formations along with the simple and compound verbs and the impersonal verbs, for instance (Law 1990: 93). Finally, Charisius and the *Anonymus Bobiensis* present a rather inelegant way of dealing with the frequentative verbs by merely stating that there are verbs that signify something being done once or more often: "*quaedam verba semel quid factum significant, ut lego, quaedam saepe, ut lecto, quaedam saepius, ut lectito*" (214, 23–25B).⁵⁶ This passage is close in its wording to the discussion in the *APS*, but neither Charisius nor the *Anonymus Bobiensis* treat this issue under the heading *numerus*, as does the author of the *APS*. Law regards the treatment of the frequentative verbs in these three grammars as "archaic" (1990: 92), and, indeed, compared to the more elaborate groupings attested in some of the later grammars, this approach does seem rather deficient. Law's discussion on the subject of the derivational formations of the verb ends with describing Priscian's method of treating this issue. Priscian takes his cue from his Greek sources and produces a neat way of dealing with the issue. His solution is the same as that appearing in the *Techne grammatike* attributed to Dionysius Thrax. This, according to Law (1990: 93), is one piece of evidence against the authenticity of the major part of the *Techne*: if Dionysius' method had been available to Latin grammarians from the earliest times, why should it have been discarded for the various *ad hoc* solutions presented by most Late Latin Grammarians?

The only textual emendation in this section is on line 26, where the manuscript reading *ita* has been changed to *item*, which is more in line with the content of the passage.

The brief discussions on composition (*figura*) have very little variation in the corpus of Late Latin grammars. The examples cited are *scribo* for simple verbs and *describo* for compound verbs (XI, 28–29), which can be found also in other grammars.⁵⁷ The author states that the process by which compound forms are produced is the same as in nouns. The usual four ways in which compound words can be formed are listed, but no examples are included, unlike in the

⁵⁶ Cf. the *Ars Bobiensis* (49, 20–21D): "*Quaedam verba semel quid factum significant, ut lego, quaedam saepius, ut lecto, quaedam semper, ut lectito; curro curso cursito*." Unlike Charisius, the *Anonymus Bobiensis* also includes a discussion on the *formae verborum* in his chapter on the verb where frequentative verbs are once again discussed, along with the other derivative formations (47, 2–6D): "*Formae verborum sunt quattuor: perfecta, meditativa, inchoativa, saepius agendi, quae et frequentativa. ... saepius agendi, ut lectito scriptito*".

⁵⁷ These examples appear also in Donatus' *Ars maior* (637, 6H), for instance.

corresponding passage in the chapter on the noun.

Person in verbs receives also rather a brief discussion in this grammar,⁵⁸ but this seems to be the case in many Late Latin grammars. While some grammars merely list the three persons of the verb, perhaps providing an example each,⁵⁹ many seek also to explain them further. Donatus, for instance, explicates person in verbs in the following manner: “*Personae uerbis accidunt tres, prima, secunda, tertia. prima est, quae dicit lego; secunda, cui dicitur legis; tertia de qua dicitur legit*” (638, 4–5H).⁶⁰ Several grammars have a similar explanation, and, in his *De lingua Latina*, also Varro wrote something to this effect.⁶¹ The content of these passages remains broadly the same, but the wording varies somewhat from one grammar to the next. The only grammar to replicate the wording used in the *APS* is the *Ars Bobiensis*,⁶² where the phrase *sermo est* is used instead of the more common verbs *dicere* (‘to say’) or *loqui* (‘to speak’).⁶³ Also the examples for the three persons of the verb are the same in these two passages.

Next, the author of the *APS* discusses tense in verbs (XI, 33–36). After listing the main tenses, that is, the present, the past, and the future tense, the author turns to the distinctions within the past tense.⁶⁴ He refers to them with the phrase “*praeteriti temporis differentiae*” (‘the subdivisions of the past tense’). This term is also employed by other grammarians, such as Donatus (637, 12H), Charisius (214, 14B), and Victorinus (*GL* 6: 199, 25), in similar passages. Other terms are used besides *differentia*; these include *gradus* in Ps.-Asper’s *ars grammatica* (*GL* 5: 551, 25), *distinctio* in Consentius’ grammar (*GL* 5: 377, 18), and *distantia* in Cledonius’ work (*GL* 5: 19, 8). *Species* is also used by several grammarians to describe the three types of the past tense; that term appears, for example, in the works of Audax (*GL* 7: 347, 2), the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (49, 13D), and Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 507, 38).

While some grammarians merely list the three types of the past tense – that is, the imperfect,

⁵⁸ XI, 31–32: “*Personae in uerbis sunt tres: prima a qua sermo est, ut ‘scribo’, secunda ad quam sermo est, ut ‘scribis’, tertia de qua sermo est, ut ‘scribit’.*”

⁵⁹ Cf. Donatus’ *Ars minor* (593, 11–12H): “*Personae uerborum quot sunt? tres. quae? prima, ut lego, secunda, ut legis, tertia, ut legit.*”

⁶⁰ “There are three persons in verbs, the first, the second, and the third person. The first person says ‘I read’, whereas to the second person we say ‘you read’, and of the third person we say ‘he reads’.”

⁶¹ *L.* 8.20: “*cum item personarum natura triplex esset, qui loqueretur, <ad quem>, de quo...*”

⁶² Compare the passage in the grammar of the *Anonymus Bobiensis* (49, 18–19D), “*Personae, sunt tres: prima ex qua sermo est, ut scribo, secunda ad quam sermo est, ut scribis, tertia de qua sermo est, ut scribit*”, with the one appearing in the *APS* (n. 58 above).

⁶³ The other grammarians who include such an explanation on the persons of the verb in their discussions use the verb *dicere* or the verb *loqui*. Diomedes does, however, use the phrase *sermo habetur* once in his discussion (*GL* 1: 334, 22). For the phrase *sermo est*, used in the *APS* and the *Ars Bobiensis*, see Schad (2007: s.v. *sermo*).

⁶⁴ XI, 33–36: “*Tempora uerbis accidunt tria: praesens, praeteritum, futurum; praesens, ut ‘lego’, praeteritum, ut ‘legi’, futurum, ut ‘legam’.* *Praeteriti temporis differentiae sunt tres: aut praeteritum perfectum, ut ‘legi’, aut praeteritum imperfectum figurae inchoatiuae, ut ‘legebam’, aut praeteritum plusquamperfectum figurae recordatiuae, ut ‘legeram’.*”

the perfect, and the pluperfect tense⁶⁵ – some add information on all or some of these types. They may stress, for instance, the fact that the pluperfect tense refers to events in the distant past, whereas the perfect is used when something has taken place more recently.⁶⁶ The *APS* contains additional information on the imperfect and the pluperfect tenses; the former is described as “*praeteritum imperfectum figurae inchoatiuae*” and the latter as “*praeteritum plusquamperfectum figurae recordatiuae*”. The perfect tense receives no additional commentary in the *APS*, unlike in certain other grammars, such as the *Instituta artium*.⁶⁷ The practices seem to vary somewhat from one grammarian to the other; not all grammarians choose to explain all three types of past tense. Consentius, for instance, does not supply any additional information on the imperfect tense, even though he includes a clarification for both the perfect and the pluperfect tenses (*GL* 5: 377, 18–21). Thus there is no pressing need to assume that the perfect tense was ever accompanied by a description like “*figurae absolutae*” in the *APS*.

According to the author of the *APS*, the imperfect tense contains a *figura inchoatiua*, and the pluperfect tense has a *figura recordatiua*. This usage of the term *figura* does not appear in other grammars, and it is thus unknown also to Schad’s *Lexicon*.⁶⁸ Where such an issue comes up in other grammars, a method of including an additional label for the tense in question is sometimes adopted, as in the *Ars Bobiensis*: “*aut perfecta et absoluta, ut legi*” (49, 14D). More often, the term *species* is used to describe the distinctions within the past tense, as in Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta artium*, where *species* is even admitted among the *accidentia* of the verb (*GL* 4: 155, 35; cf. n. 67). Sacerdos is somewhat less clear in his use of the term *species*; he does not mention the division of the past tense into three when discussing verbal tense, nor does he discuss *species* as an independent property of the verb, like Ps.-Probus. Still, he uses the term *species* in a similar way to Ps.-Probus in a passage on verbal mood where he describes the imperfect tense as being also “*specie inchoativa*”.⁶⁹ Furthermore, he uses the term *species* in a similar manner in the verbal conjugations toward the end of his chapter on the verb (e.g., *GL* 6: 435, 32ff.). But Sacerdos also has another use for this term; it

⁶⁵ Cf. Donatus’ *Ars maior* (637, 13–638, 1H): “*sed praeteriti temporis differentiae sunt tres, imperfecta, perfecta, plusquamperfecta: imperfecta, ut legebam; perfecta, ut legi; plusquamperfecta, ut legeram.*”

⁶⁶ Cf. Audax (*GL* 7: 347, 7–10): “*praeteritum perfectum est, cum nuper aliquid nos fecisse significamus, ut legi. praeteritum plusquamperfectum est, cum non nuper, sed iamdudum aliquid perfecisse nos intimamus, ut legeram.*”

⁶⁷ *GL* 4: 159, 39–160, 1: “*de specie. species verborum sunt tres, imperfecta, quae est minus quam perfecta sive inchoativa, perfecta, quae est et absoluta, plusquamperfecta, quae est et recordativa sive exacta.*”

⁶⁸ Cf. Schad (2007: s.v. *figura*). The headword *figura* is divided into four subcategories: 1. inflectional/derivational form (verb forms inflected for person, derivational formations, and active vs. passive verb forms are included in this category), 2. the ‘form’ of a phrase (*Graeca figura/appellationes quae cum figura dicuntur...*), 3. the structure of a word (*simplex* vs. *composita*), 4. the written form (of a letter, or rather a speech sound).

⁶⁹ *GL* 6: 432, 20–24: “*quod tempus, futurum scilicet modi pronuntiativi, quidam modum dicunt promissivum. –sed errant: nam tempus est futurum specie promissiva, sicut tempus praeteritum imperfectum specie inchoativa et tempus praeteritum plusquamperfectum specie recordativa.*”

appears frequently as a synonym for the term *genus* in his grammar (see n. 21 above). The term *species* is used in distinguishing the three types of the past tense also in the grammars of Charisius (226, 6–229, 30B) and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 347, 37ff.), where it is used in the verbal conjugations to characterize the different tenses. Both of these grammarians also use the term *species* in another way: Diomedes uses it alongside the term *qualitas* for the derivational formations and other formal subtypes of the verb (cf. n. 15 above),⁷⁰ and Charisius uses the term in a more general way to denote any kind of subtype.⁷¹ *Species* is a common grammatical term with numerous different uses listed in Schad's *Lexicon*.⁷² The term employed in the *APS* to describe this phenomenon, *figura*, is also problematic in having more than one meaning: the term *figura* is more widely used for the structure of words (e.g., *figura composita*), being one of the *accidentia* of the verb, for instance, in Late Latin grammars. It is not a rare occurrence in ancient grammars to have overlapping uses for many of the terms due to their rather similar meanings (e.g., *figura*, *forma*, *species*).⁷³

Coniugatio ('conjugation') is the last *accidens* discussed by the author of the *APS* in the chapter on the verb. The discussion is rather brief, and no full paradigms are set out for any of the conjugations. The short passage on conjugation in the *APS* coincides with the beginning of the account of verbal conjugation attributed to Cominianus by Charisius (225, 25–226, 5B). This is by no means the only passage where the text of the *APS* coincides with material attributed to Cominianus.⁷⁴

After discussing all the *accidentia*, the author of the *APS* adds two further passages, in which the inchoative and defective verbs are treated. In some grammars inchoative verbs are treated outside the framework of the *accidentia*, as is the case here.⁷⁵ Many grammarians, however, incorporate these types of verbs into the system of the *accidentia*, discussing them under the heading *qualitas*⁷⁶ or *genus*.⁷⁷ The other types of verbs normally discussed under the heading

⁷⁰ In his discussion on *qualitas* (*GL* 1: 342, 28ff.), Diomedes uses the terms *qualitas*, *species*, and *forma* indiscriminately, when discussing the subcategories of the *accidens qualitas*: "*De absoluta verborum specie. Absoluta verborum qualitas est ...*" or "*De iterativa verborum forma. Iterativa sive frequentativa est verborum qualitas quae ...*".

⁷¹ See 212, 5–11B or 214, 26–28B.

⁷² The uses of the term *species* (Schad 2007: s.v. *species*) span three pages in the *Lexicon*, and they are grouped under the following headings: 1. 'type, kind, category', 2. 'subcategory', 3. 'species' as a particular subcategory of noun, 4. the characteristic of being basic/derived (this sense is unique to Priscian and matches Ps.-Dionysius Thrax's εἶδος), 5. 'physical realisation, appearance, form', often as opposed to meaning.

⁷³ All these terms mean, roughly speaking, the same.

⁷⁴ See the discussion in chapter 1.4.

⁷⁵ Charisius has a separate chapter, entitled *De inchoativis* (329, 22–331, 2B), in which he discusses inchoative verbs.

⁷⁶ See the discussions by Diomedes, Donatus, Dositheus, and Victorinus. See the account of the *qualitas uerborum*, e.g., p. 155 n. 15–17 above.

⁷⁷ For Sacerdos' and Ps.-Probus' accounts of the *accidens genus*, see n. 21 above. Ps.-Asper has a unique solution; he presents the inchoative verbs under the heading *figura*, which is reserved for only the simple and compound verbs in most grammars (*GL* 5: 551, 21–24): "*figurae sunt septem, simplex, ut lego, composita, ut relego, inchoativa, ut calesco,*

qualitas (*perfecta, meditatiua, frequentatiua*, and the like) do not receive a separate treatment of their own in this grammar. Frequentative verbs are, however, referred to in the discussion on *numerus* (see n. 53–54 above, p. 160).

The first part in the chapter on inchoative verbs (XI, 45–49) lists the main aspects of these verbs and their origin. The first thing that the author of the *APS* states is that inchoative verbs have no past tense (“*Sunt uerba quae praeteritum tempus non habent*” XI, 45), and a few lines later he mentions, more specifically, that these verbs do not have a perfect-tense form: “*Quae ideo non habent praeteritum perfectum, quoniam...*” (XI, 48–49). This is a sentiment shared by most Late Latin grammarians, but there are differences as to the details in the various discussions. Some grammarians merely mention the lack of the past tense,⁷⁸ some specify that it is the perfect tense that is missing,⁷⁹ and some, like Cledonius, list all the items missing from the paradigm of inchoative verbs.⁸⁰

The second aspect the author of the *APS* mentions is that inchoative verbs end in the letters *sco*. He then proceeds to give examples of such verbs: “*eaque fere in ‘sco’ litteras exeunt et appellantur inchoatiua, ut ‘tepesco, feruesco’*” (XI, 45–46). As an afterthought, he adds that the perfect forms *ferui* and *calui* are not derived from the kinds of verbs just discussed but from verbs such as *ferueo* and *caleo* (XI, 46–47).⁸¹ I considered moving this phrase to line 49 at the end of this section, where it would, perhaps, have made more sense, following right after the discussion on why inchoative verbs have no perfect-tense forms. At its present position this information is separated from the beginning, where a mention is made of the lack of past tense, by a rather long passage.⁸² Also, the examples on line 46 (*tepesco, feruesco*) do not match the ones quoted right after (*ferui, calui*). However, as the text remains understandable and contains no clear signs of corruption, the order of sentences in this passage was left as it stands in the manuscript.

The Late Latin grammarians have, generally speaking, two different approaches to explaining how inchoative verbs are formed: either they state that inchoative verbs have their origin in neuter

frequentativa, ut lectito, desiderativa, ut dormito, impersonalis, ut piget taedet, et alterius formae, ut statur, paragona, ut facesso laceesso capesso”.

⁷⁸ Cf. Donatus (633, 9–10H): “*inchoatiua non per omnia tempora declinantur, quia quae inchoantur praeteritum tempus non habent*”.

⁷⁹ Cf. Charisius (329, 30–31B): “*nec habent praeteritum perfectum, quia quod inchoatum est non est perfectum*.”

⁸⁰ Cledonius (*GL* 5: 17, 2–6) lists the characteristics of inchoative verbs thus: “*inchoativae formae haec debent congruere, ut oriatur a neutrali verbo, ut in sco syllabam exeat, ut tertiae sit coniugationis semper, ut careat tempore perfecto et plusquamperfecto et participio futuri temporis: calesco praesentis temporis, calescebam imperfecti, calescam futuri*.” The same or similar specifications appear also in several other commentaries of Donatus, e.g., those by Pompey (*GL* 5: 219, 18–24), Ps.-Sergius (*GL* 4: 505, 25–29), and Servius (*GL* 4: 413, 4–8).

⁸¹ XI, 46–47: “*ferui enim et calui ab his ueniunt, quae sunt ferueo et caleo*”.

⁸² XI, 45–46: “*...eaque fere in ‘sco’ litteras exeunt et appellantur inchoatiua, ut ‘tepesco, feruesco’ ...*”.

verbs, like Donatus⁸³ (633, 10H), or they list the endings of the verbs that can produce inchoative verbs, that is, those ending in *o* or *or* in the indicative present-tense first-person singular, like Charisius (329, 28–30B).⁸⁴

In this *APS*, however, only the verbs ending in *o* are listed: “*Haec autem species uerborum ab his deducitur, quae o littera indicatiuo finiuntur, ut horreo horresco, tepeo tepesco*” (XI, 47–48). This approach aligns the grammar more closely with the works of Charisius, Diomedes, and Sacerdos. That the discussion on the origin of inchoative verbs in the *APS* does not correspond exactly with any of the discussions in Charisius’, Diomedes’, or Sacerdos’ grammars need not, in my opinion, be indicative of any kind of an omission. It is, of course, possible that verbs ending in *or* were originally mentioned after the ones ending in *o*, but no trace of such a mention exists in the text as it stands in the manuscript. In any case, inchoative verbs derived from verbs ending in *or* are rare; the same example, that is, *misereor miserescō*,⁸⁵ is mentioned by almost all grammarians discussing this issue.

Merely stating that inchoative verbs can be derived from verbs ending in *o* in the indicative mood is not a completely satisfactory way of describing the issue in question. This approach only precludes passive and deponent verbs as well as defective verbs ending in *i*, *m*, or *t* (e.g., *odi*, *inquam*, *pudet*) from producing inchoative verbs. Active verbs (i.e., transitive verbs) also end in *o* in the indicative (e.g., *lego*), but inchoative verbs cannot be derived from active verbs. The problem of describing the origin of inchoative verbs in an unsatisfactory manner is not limited to the *APS*. The grammars of Charisius, Diomedes, and Sacerdos, which only list the endings of the verbs that can produce inchoative verbs, share in this complication. The approach that names neuter (i.e., intransitive) verbs as the source of inchoative verbs is thus preferable, but it only appears in grammars from Donatus onward. This approach does not, however, address the issue of inchoatives of the type *miserescō* (from the verb *misereor*).

⁸³ The *Ars maior*: “... et oriuntur a neutrali uerbo.” This is the more common approach. Donatus is the grammarian who first (in any extant Latin grammar) mentions neuter verbs as generating inchoative verbs. This explanation appears in most grammars post-dating his work. However, Charisius and Diomedes, near-contemporaries of Donatus, have the older, less satisfying approach of listing the endings of the verbs (*o/or*) from which inchoative verbs can be derived.

⁸⁴ Charisius: “... sive ab his uerbis veniant quae o littera terminantur, ut horreo horresco, sive ab his quae r littera terminantur, ut misereor miserescō.” See also Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 430, 25–27): “figurantur autem inchoativa uerba aut ab his quae o littera terminantur, ut horreo horresco, vel ex his quae or terminantur, ut misereor miserescō” and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 343, 3–6): “haec sco syllaba terminatur et figuratur vel ab illis quae o littera terminantur, ut horreo, id est in horreo sum, horresco, horrere incipio, vel ab illis quae r littera cluduntur, ut misereor miserescō”. In addition to the *APS*, only these three grammarians use this method, although Diomedes, toward the end of his discussion on inchoative verbs (*GL* 1: 344, 12), mentions that inchoative verbs can be derived either from neuter verbs or even nouns: “deducuntur item inchoativa a neutris uerbis et appellationibus”.

⁸⁵ Priscian feels that *miserescō* is derived from *misereor*, not *misereor* (*GL* 2: 428, 13–19): “... misereor miserescō (sed magis a misereor est, quo vetustissimi sunt usi, ut supra dictum est. Ennius in *V annalium*: «cogebant hosteis lacrimantes, ut misererent». ex quo impersonale est miseret et miseretur. ... nam a misereor, quod est deponens, nec inchoativum in o desinens nec impersonale posset nasci)”.

The last lines of this section (XI, 48–49) contain two textual problems. The reading of the manuscript M is “*quae ideo non habent praeteritum perfectum quoniam hae uocales inchoationem non perfectam significant*” (XI, 48–49), but that reading cannot be correct in this context. *Voces* (‘words’) seems the most likely emendation for the odd reading *uocales* (‘vowels’), thus restoring the sense of the passage, ‘These verbs do not have a perfect tense form, because they signify beginning something, not completing it’.

The second textual problem concerns the manuscript reading *perfectam*, which makes little sense on its own. The same idea that is expressed here, namely that verbs that signify beginning something cannot rationally have a perfect-tense form, is expressed in many grammars with varying wordings.⁸⁶ The emendation of *perfectam* to *perfectum* would require the least tampering with the manuscript reading and also complete the sense of the passage. The reading *perfectam* would require a noun to complement it (e.g., *rem perfectam*). The noun *perfectus* denoting ‘perfection’ or ‘result’ is very rare (cf. Vitr. 10.3.1); *perfectio* would be a much more common term. Confusing *perfectum* with *perfectam* would, however, be easier, and instances of mistaking the very similar endings *-tum* and *-tam* occur also elsewhere in the text.⁸⁷ Another way of emending this passage would be to reject the reading *inchoationem* (‘beginning’): *inchoatio* (or *incohatio*) is not attested in the grammars of the CGL database; it is a Late Latin term, which is mostly attested in Christian writings. An emendation to the manuscript reading suggested by Professor De Nonno, *inchoat<am acti>onem*, restores the sense of the passage and also accommodates the reading *perfectam*.

The second part of the section discussing inchoative verbs (XI, 50–55) deals with the verbs from which inchoative verbs are derived; these verbs are referred to as “*primae positionis uerba*” (XI, 50).⁸⁸ The author of the APS observes that some of these verbs are in use; for instance, *tepeo*, *palleo*, and *ferueo* produce the forms *tepesco*, *pallesco*, and *feruesco*. Some, like *albeo*, *iuueneo*, and *seneo*, are not in use, even though the corresponding inchoative verbs *albesco*, *iuuenesco*, and *senesco* are.

There are no serious textual problems in this passage (XI, 50–55). Aside from simple misspellings, the only instance where a more significant change was made is on line 51, where the manuscript reading *caleo* was changed to *ferueo*. This change was based on the preceding inchoative verb forms (*tepesco*, *feruesco*, and *pallesco*). Another possibility would have been to

⁸⁶ See, for instance, Sacerdos: “*haec non habet tempus praeteritum perfectum rationabiliter: nam res quae modo incipit perfecta esse non potest*” (GL 6: 430, 21–22) or the Regulae of Ps.-Augustine: “*Et ideo inchoativa dicuntur perfectum tempus non habere, quia quae inchoamus adhuc perfecta non sunt*” (99, 14–16Ma).

⁸⁷ See IX, 44; XI, 5.

⁸⁸ See also Schad (2007: s.v. *positio* I.i).

assume that at some stage of the transmission both *calesco* and *ferueo* would have been omitted from the list of the inchoative verbs and the list of the corresponding basic verb forms. But a copyist might more easily have miscopied *caleo*, which appears a few lines before this point; thus the simple recourse of substituting *ferueo* for *caleo* was chosen here.

The quotations in this passage, Virgil *Aen.* 12.36⁸⁹ and Catullus 4.25–26,⁹⁰ appear also elsewhere in the corpus of Late Latin grammars. Both Charisius and Diomedes include these two quotations in their discussions on inchoative verbs (329, 22–331, 2B; *GL* 1: 343, 1–344, 26).⁹¹ Eutyches (*GL* 5: 464, 19) and Priscian (*GL* 2: 397, 9) use the same Virgil quotation in a different context. In addition to the aforementioned two instances in Charisius’ and Diomedes’ works, the quotation from Catullus only appears in Priscian’s *Institutiones* (*GL* 2: 484, 3), in a discussion on the past participles of neuter verbs.

In Servius’ commentary on the *Aeneid*, the comment on verse 12.36 is particularly interesting: Servius comments on Virgil’s use of the (non-existent) verb form *albent*, using the phrase “*Vergilius usurpauit*” to describe his usage.⁹² In the *APS*, the author uses a closely resembling description, “*Vergilius figurauit*” (XI, 52–53), of Virgil’s use of the verb *albent* in *Aen.* 12.36.

Lastly, the author of the *APS* discusses defective verbs. As was the case with inchoative verbs, defective verbs are not incorporated into the system of the *accidentia* in this grammar. This approach is relatively common among Late Latin grammarians. Charisius has a separate discussion entitled *De defectivis* in the third book of his grammar (323, 10–329, 21B). Donatus briefly discusses defective verbs after discussing all the *accidentia* of the verb,⁹³ as do also Victorinus and Audax. Some grammarians have chosen to integrate this discussion into the framework of the *accidentia* of the verb; Diomedes, for instance, includes defective verbs (as *defectiva species*) under *qualitas*, whereas Sacerdos treats them under the *accidens genus*, as is the case also with Ps.-Probus.⁹⁴

This section contains several omissions, but with help from the corresponding passage in the

⁸⁹ *Aen.* 12.36: “*campique ingentes ossibus albent*”.

⁹⁰ Catullus 4.25–26: “*nunc recondita / senet quiete*”.

⁹¹ Charisius includes just the two aforementioned literary quotations in his discussion on the inchoative verbs, whereas Diomedes’ discussion includes also additional quotations from Virgil, Terence, Plautus, and Naevius. Charisius’ discussion is very close to the one appearing in the *APS* in its scope, if not always in its wording.

⁹² I would like to thank Prof. De Nonno for pointing out the similarity between these two passages.

⁹³ Donatus does, however, include examples of defective verbs also in his discussion on verbal voice (*genus*) (635, 12H), but he does not label the verb forms as defective verbs: “*sunt etiam neutra, quae i littera terminantur, ut odi, novi, memini*”.

⁹⁴ For Diomedes’ solution, see n. 15 above. For Sacerdos’ and Ps.-Probus’ approach, see n. 21 above.

Explanations it can be reconstructed to a certain degree.⁹⁵ This last part in the chapter on the verb can be further divided into three parts, the first of which (XI, 56–58) is a general description of defective verbs, including some of their endings.⁹⁶ The first lines of the section on defective verbs have been preserved relatively well, and the addition of *dicuntur* (XI, 57) is the only noteworthy change to the text. The addition is based on the passage preserved in the *Explanations*.⁹⁷ The definition for defective verbs occurring in the *APS* is etymological: “*Sunt uerba quae in declinatione deficiunt et ideo defectiua <dicuntur>*”.⁹⁸ The same definition is used in the *Explanations* and, in a somewhat longer form, in Diomedes⁹⁹ and Audax’s¹⁰⁰ grammars.

The next section begins with the author listing three ways in which verbs can be defective. However, the manuscript text is corrupt at this point, and thus we cannot be sure that the list originally contained three categories; it is possible that there were more. The text, as it stands, lists verbs that are defective in either their form, their voice, or their tense (XI, 59–62):¹⁰¹

Defectiua autem uerba tribus modis fiunt, quotiens aut figura mutantur, ut ‘refero refers refert’, ‘rettuli rettulisti rettulit’, ‘referebam’ et ‘rettuleram’; per qualitates, ut ‘fio factus sum’, ‘soleo solitus sum’; per tempora, ut ‘memini meministi meminit’, de hinc ‘memineram memineras meminerat’, quae in pronuntiatu <modo solo inueniuntur ...>

The term *tempus* (‘tense’) needs no further comment at this point. The term *figura*, however, merits some discussion. *Figura* is most often used in this grammar (and most other grammars) to refer to the structure or composition of a word – that is, whether it is a simple or compound word. It usually features as one of the *accidentia* in chapters discussing the parts of speech. In the aforementioned instance (XI, 59) the term *figura* cannot be understood as referring to the composition of the

⁹⁵ The text on lines XI, 56–66 corresponds to a section in the second book of the *Explanations* (GL 4: 557, 4–15).

⁹⁶ The author of the *APS* lists examples of defective verbs ending in either the letter *i* or the letter *o* (XI, 56–58): “*De uerbis defectiuis. Sunt uerba quae in declinatione deficiunt et ideo defectiua <dicuntur>, eaque fere in ‘i’ littera exeunt, ut ‘odi, noui, memini, coepi, pepigi’, aut in ‘o’, ut ‘soleo, fido, fio, meto, audeo, gaudeo’.*” No mention is made of defective verbs ending in the letter *m*, such as *inquam*. Verbs of the type *pudet*, which are discussed by many other grammarians among the defective verbs, are mentioned in conjunction with the impersonal mood in the *APS* (XI, 23).

⁹⁷ The text of the *Explanations* (GL 4: 557, 4–6) preserves a slightly different list of examples: the verbs *coepi*, *pepigi*, and *fio* are missing from that list. I have chosen to include these examples in the edited text, as later omissions in the course of the transmission of the text are more likely than additions.

⁹⁸ “There are verbs with a defective paradigm, which are therefore called defective verbs.”

⁹⁹ GL 1: 346, 12–14: “*Defectiva verborum species est cum in declinatione verba deficiunt nec habent aut omnia tempora aut omnes numeros aut omnes personas aut omnes modos.*”

¹⁰⁰ GL 7: 347, 13–15: “*Defectiva uerba quae sunt? Quae in declinatione deficiunt, id est in genere vel persona vel coniugatione vel tempore, et quia uniformi modo durare non possunt, ob id defectiua dicuntur.*”

¹⁰¹ “Verbs can be defective in three ways, in terms of their form, which may change within the inflectional paradigm, as in *refero refers refert*, *rettuli rettulisti rettulit*, *referebam* and *rettuleram*, as regards their voice, as in *fio factus sum* and *soleo solitus sum*, and in terms of their tense, as in *memini meministi meminit*, from which the forms *memineram memineras meminerat* are derived. These forms only occur in the indicative mood.”

defective verb, as both *refero* and *rettuli* are composed of two parts.¹⁰² In Schad's *Lexicon* (2007: s.v. *figura* 1 ii) there occur some instances of the term *figura* used in a similar manner. Schad classes these instances under the heading of verbal inflection. In addition to the passage in the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 557, 7), which is, of course, identical to the passage under question, Schad quotes Charisius (325, 10–14B) and Sacerdos (GL 6: 430, 29–30). In both these passages the term *figura* is used in conjunction with defective verbs that show variation in their inflectional paradigm. Both of these grammarians also give the verb *fero tuli* as an example of this phenomenon.

Qualitas in the sense of verbal voice is also rather rare. In the *APS* the term *genus* denotes voice in the chapter on the verb (XI, 9ff.); in the chapter on the participle, where *genus* denotes grammatical gender, *significatio* is the term used for voice (XII, 9ff.). *Qualitas* is used by Dositheus to signify voice in the chapter on the participle (38, 11Bo). Ps.-Probus uses *qualitas* alongside *genus* in the chapter on the verb, and he uses the term *qualitas* alone when discussing voice in participles.¹⁰³ Only in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* can we find the term *qualitas* used in a similar context as in the *APS*.¹⁰⁴

In addition to the *APS*, a division of defective verbs into three types can be found in the grammar of Sacerdos. Like the author of the *APS*, he divides defective verbs into those showing deficiencies in their form, voice, or tense.¹⁰⁵ The grammar of Diomedes,¹⁰⁶ the *Instituta artium*,¹⁰⁷ Audax's *Excerpta*,¹⁰⁸ and the *Excerpta Andecavensia*¹⁰⁹ each have a list containing four types of

¹⁰² The *Excerpta Andecavensia* actually includes a category of defective verbs deficient in terms of their composition (*figura*). Here the term *figura* denotes composition, as is clear from the following example (242, 30–33DN): “*Verba deficienti modis quattuor, elocutione qualitate tempore figura: elocutione, ut fero fers tuli facit; qualitate, ut soleo soles solitus sum facit; tempore, ut odi novi memini (haec praeteritum tempus non habent); figura, sisto sistis constiti facit*”.

¹⁰³ In Ps.-Probus' grammar the property *genus/qualitas* contains not only the categories for verbal voice (active, passive, neuter, deponent, and common), but also derivational formations, etc. For the discussion on verbs, see n. 21 above. For the discussion on participles, see GL 4: 138, 39–139, 3: “*De qualitate. qualitas participiorum est qua intelleguntur participia ex quibus verbis oriuntur. oriuntur autem participia ex omnibus octo qualitatibus verborum; scilicet quoniam octo sunt qualitates vel genera verborum, id est neutrale activum passivum deponens commune inchoativum frequentativum et defectivum*”.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. XI, 60–61 with the corresponding passage in the *Excerpta Andecavensia* (n. 102 above).

¹⁰⁵ Sacerdos, GL 6: 430, 29–431, 1: “*Defectiva species tribus modis fit: elocutione, quam quidam figuram vocant, ut fero tuli, feror latus sum, <sum> fui; specie, quam quidam genus vel adfectum vel significationem dicunt, ut soleo solitus sum, fio factus sum, audeo ausus sum, gaudeo gavisus sum. ... fit defectiva species et tempore, ut odi novi memini pepigi*.” There is no mention of this use of *elocutio* found in Sacerdos' grammar and the *Excerpta Andecavensia* in Schad (2007: s.v. *elocutio*). *Figura*, the term with which Sacerdos glosses the term *elocutio* is discussed above.

¹⁰⁶ Diomedes (GL 1: 346, 12–14) lists verbs defective in terms of their tense (*tempus*), number (*numerus*), person (*persona*), or mood (*modus*), but he includes no specific examples for any of these types.

¹⁰⁷ Ps.-Probus (GL 4: 158, 14–17) lists verbs defective as regards their mood (*modus*), voice (*species*), person (*persona*), or inflection (*declinatio*). He includes no specific examples for any of these categories.

¹⁰⁸ Audax (GL 7: 347, 13–15) lists four types of defective verbs, which are deficient in terms of their voice (*genus*), person (*persona*), conjugation (*coniugatio*), or tense (*tempus*). He includes examples only for the first type (GL 7: 347, 15–18): “*genere igitur deficient, cum neutra significatione tempore praesenti ad passivam speciem in praeterito tempore transeunt, ut audeo ausus sum, gaudeo gavisus sum, soleo solitus sum*”.

¹⁰⁹ *Excerpta Andecavensia* (see n. 102 above) lists defective verbs deficient as regards their form/paradigm (*elocutio*), voice (*qualitas*), tense (*tempus*), or composition (*figura*).

defective verbs. The grammars of Victorinus and Phocas list five types of defective verbs. Victorinus lists verbs deficient in terms of the voice, person, conjugation, tense, and mood, but he gives only four types of examples for defective verbs. He conflates the categories of conjugation and tense giving only one example for both, *fero tuli*.¹¹⁰ Thus it is hard to say whether for him conjugation and tense are meant to be one category or two separate categories. Phocas lists verbs deficient in terms of person, mood, tense, conjugation, and, curiously, participles.¹¹¹ Finally, Donatus lists eight categories of defective verbs (639, 8–10H), with one example each.¹¹²

The text at this point (XI, 59–62) is rather corrupt;¹¹³ there is at least one lacuna on line 62, for instance. There could also be room for emendation at the beginning of the passage; the editor of the *Explanations*, H. Keil, suggests in his apparatus (GL 4: 557) that the passage “*defectiva autem verba tribus modis fiunt, quotiens aut figura mutantur, ut refero refers refert, retuli retulisti retulit, referebam et retuleram; per qualitates, ut fio factus sum, soleo solitus sum; per tempora autem, ut memini...*” (GL 4: 557, 6–9) could be emended to “...*quotiens aut figura mutantur <aut qualitate aut temporibus: figura mutantur>, ut*”. One would, perhaps, expect more coherence from the passage listing the types of defective verbs,¹¹⁴ but Keil’s suggested emendation does not, in my opinion, resolve the issue in a completely satisfactory manner.

The lacuna on line 62 after the word *pronuntiatio* is a more serious problem; what follows next in the manuscript (*uenientia in ...*) clearly belongs to the discussion of the next issue (XI, 63–66). The text of the *Explanations* can, however, help in restoring the omitted text. The manuscript that Keil relies on for the text of the *Explanations II*, L, reads: “... *quae in pronuntiativo modo solo inveniuntur. sunt verba quae a simili pronuntiativo venientia...*” (GL 4: 557, 10–11). The underlined text is missing from the manuscript M. So far, the text on lines 61–62 would thus read: “... *per tempora, ut memini meministi meminit, de hinc memineram memineras meminerat, quae in*

¹¹⁰ Victorinus, GL 6: 200, 14–17: “*Coniugatione et praeterito tempore quae deficiunt? Vt fero fers fert: facit enim praeterito tuli, nec apparet, quod sit coniugationis, cum secundum formam supra dictam indicativi modi nulla vocalis ante novissimam litteram inveniatur.*”

¹¹¹ Phocas, GL 5: 435 17–18. Also Phocas discusses verbs defective as regards their conjugation and tense together: “*In coniugationibus et praeterito deficiunt haec:*” (GL 5: 436, 17ff.).

¹¹² Cledonius (GL 5: 61, 31–62, 13) follows Donatus in his account of defective verbs, adding more information to Donatus’ brief account. He has, for instance, “*sunt verba defectiva alia per modos, ut cedo: cedo quando significat dic, inperativum tantum modum habet. ideo per modos defectivum est, facit autem pluralem cete*” (GL 5: 61, 31–33), where Donatus’ account is “*Sunt verba defectiva alia per modos, ut cedo...*” (639, 8H). He seems to omit some of Donatus’ subcategories, though, but that may be due to the poor state of the preserved text.

¹¹³ XI, 59–62: “*Defectiva autem verba tribus modis fiunt; quotiens aut figura mutantur, ut ‘refero, refers, refert’; ‘retuli, retulisti, retulit’; ‘referebam’ et ‘retuleram’; per qualitates, ut ‘fio, factus sum’, ‘soleo, solitus sum’; per tempora, ut ‘memini, meministi, meminit’; de hinc ‘memineram, memineras, meminerat’; quae in pronuntiativo <...>.*”

¹¹⁴ For instance: “*quotiens aut figura mutantur, ut ‘refero’, ...; aut qualitate, ut ‘fio, factus sum’ ...; aut tempore, ut ‘memini’...*”.

pronuntiatio <modo solo inueniuntur.>”¹¹⁵ But is the use of the verb *memini* restricted to the indicative mood (here called *pronuntiatus modus*)? Charisius, for instance, includes the paradigm of the verb *memini* in a chapter entitled *De confusis*.¹¹⁶ There he lists, for example, the optative forms *utinam meminero* and *utinam meminissem*, and the subjunctive forms *cum meminero* and *cum meminissem*. The imperative mood (*memento, mementote*) is also included in the paradigm. But Victorinus, in his discussion on defective verbs (*GL* 6: 200, 18–19), lists the verbs *odi*, *memini*, and *novi* as examples of verbs deficient in terms of mood.¹¹⁷ Thus, there seems to be some, albeit slight, support for the view expressed in the *APS*, namely that forms of the verb *memini* are restricted to the indicative mood.

The editor of the *Explanationes* has chosen a different way to interpret this lacunose passage. He has added the words *sunt verba* between *meminerat* and *quae* on line 10.¹¹⁸ He has thus created an independent phrase that we could translate as ‘there are verbs which only occur in the indicative mood’. No examples are provided for these verbs, whatever they might be, unlike for all the other types of defective verbs discussed in this section (*GL* 4: 557, 4–15 = XI, 56–66).

It is also possible that more text is missing at this point than merely the words *sunt verba*, as Keil suggests. There could be a description for one more type of defective verb, namely that deficient in terms of mood. And the description “... *quae in pronuntiatio modo solo inueniuntur*” could refer to examples from that class of defective verbs. Donatus, Diomedes, Ps.-Probus, Phocas, and Victorinus discuss verbs defective in terms of mood; three of those grammarians, Donatus, Phocas, and Victorinus, also provide examples for such verbs. Donatus’ discussion (see n. 112) is very brief, with only one example (*cedo*). Victorinus lists that same example, along with the verbs *odi*, *novi*, and *memini* (see n. 117). *Memini* already appears in the *APS* as an example of a verb defective in terms of tense, and *cedo* as an imperative form is not a suitable example either, because an example that could be described as only occurring in the indicative mood is required here. Phocas lists several examples of verbs defective in terms of mood (*GL* 5: 436, 4ff.), but many of

¹¹⁵ “And as regards their tense, as in *memini meministi meminit* (I remember, you remember, he remembers); from these forms are derived the forms *memineram memineras meminerat* (I remembered, you remembered, he remembered), all of which only occur in the indicative mood.”

¹¹⁶ Charisius discusses verbs like *odi*, *novi*, and *memini* under the heading *De confusis*, instead of the chapter on defective verbs (*De defectivis*); still, such verbs are deemed by him defective in terms of tense: “*Sunt quaedam verba confusa temporibus, velut odi novi pepigi memini. in his enim instans et perfectum tempus idem est, item imperfectum et plusquamperfectum, nec participia fere habent. temporibus haec deficere dicuntur. declinantur autem hoc modo*” (337, 15–19B).

¹¹⁷ *GL* 6: 200, 18–20: “*Modis quae deficiunt? Odi memini novi, oderam meminero noveram, quae sola duo tempora praeterita indicativo modo inveniuntur. item cedo cedite, quae sola imperativo deprehenduntur ceteris modis deficientibus.*”

¹¹⁸ *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 557, 10–11): “...*meminerat. sunt verba quae in pronuntiativo modo solo inveniuntur.*” Keil italicized the words *sunt verba* in the edited text and gave the information that the words were not in the manuscript in the apparatus.

them, like *cedo*, *ave*, or *salve*, would not be appropriate here, because they appear only in the imperative mood. Some of his examples only have a few forms in the indicative, or even just a single form (e.g., *aio*, *quaeso*, *infit*). Such verbs could be considered suitable examples for a category of verbs defective in terms of mood described as only appearing in the indicative. In the edited text, however, such a reconstruction has not been attempted, and only the three categories that are preserved in the manuscript text occur in this passage (XI, 59–62).

On the last few lines in the chapter on the verb, the author of the *APS* presents a topic that is not, strictly speaking, related to defective verbs.¹¹⁹ However, the author has not given these lines any title of their own,¹²⁰ and also other grammarians, such as Victorinus (*GL* 6: 200 21–23), treat these kinds of verbs immediately after defective verbs. The author of the *APS* mentions two types of verbs: verbs that share an identical present-tense form but have different perfect-tense forms (e.g., *pando* = *pandi/pandaui*), and verbs that share an identical perfect-tense form, but differ in their present-tense forms (e.g., *lugeo/luceo* = *luxi*).¹²¹

Discussions on this type of phenomenon occur also in other grammars, in addition to the identical passage in the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 557, 11–15). Both types of verbs are often mentioned in such a discussion, but this is not always the case.¹²² The first type (XI, 63–64) has only one parallel, in addition to the corresponding passage in the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 557, 11–13); Consentius' grammar has a similar passage as regards its content and examples but not its wording.¹²³ Some grammarians, like Sacerdos¹²⁴ and the compiler of the *Excerpta Andecavensia*,¹²⁵ discuss these kinds of verbs but use different examples in their discussion. The second type (XI, 65–66) is discussed by more grammarians; the grammars of Sacerdos, Consentius, Diomedes,

¹¹⁹ Other grammarians choose to treat this issue in a different context. They may, for instance, discuss these verbs after listing inflectional paradigms and ways in which perfect stems are formed in each conjugation (cf. Diomedes, *GL* 1: 371: 27ff.). As this kind of discussion does not fit into the framework of the *accidentia*, it is usually treated toward the end of the chapter on the verb, along with other miscellaneous material (cf. Ps.-Probus, *GL* 4: 186, 17–20).

¹²⁰ Although the omission of a title could be due to problems in the transmission of the text at this point.

¹²¹ XI, 63–66: “*Sunt uerba quae a simili praesenti uenientia in praeterito perfecto in diuersas partes declinationis separantur, ut ‘pando’ facit ‘pandi’ et ‘pandaui’, et ‘sero’ facit ‘serui’ et ‘seraui’. Item contraria <quae> a <diuersis> praesentibus uenientia in praeterito perfecto similia faciunt, ut ‘lugeo’ <et ‘luceo’> faciunt ‘luxi’, et ‘cerno’ et ‘cresco’ faciunt ‘creui’.*”

¹²² Victorinus, Ps.-Probus, Phocas, and Diomedes do not discuss the case where the verbs have identical present-tense forms but different perfect-tense forms.

¹²³ *GL* 5: 384, 22–26: “*item illud evenit, ut similia uerba in prima persona indicatiui modi dissimiles figuras pro his significationibus, quas diversae naturae uerbis exhibent, in declinationibus sumant, ut est pando et sero. faciunt enim praeteritum perfectum pandi et pandavi, serui et seravi.*”

¹²⁴ *GL* 6: 433, 2–5: “*sunt e contrario quae simili tempore praesenti orta in tempore perfecto separantur, ut parco ignosco et seruo: ignosco facit peperci, ut ‘nec voci iraeque pepercit’; parco uero seruo facit parsi, ut Terentius in Hecyra ‘hancine ego vitam parsi perdere’.*”

¹²⁵ 242, 27–29DN: “*item in praesenti tempore similia, in praeterito diuersa, ut parco parcis, quod significat seruo, parsi facit in praeterito et peperci.*”

Victorinus,¹²⁶ Ps.-Probus, and Phocas, and the *Excerpta Andecavensia* contain such a discussion.

The text at this point has been transmitted in rather a corrupt state. The omission in M (XI, 62) that was to some extent restored with help from the text of the *Explanationes* was already discussed above. The beginning of the section (XI, 63ff.) has also been omitted at some stage of the transmission. The manuscript transmitting the *Explanationes II* reads as follows (GL 4: 557, 10ff):

... quae in pronuntiativo modo solo inveniuntur. sunt verba quae a simili pronuntiativo
venientia in praeterito perfecto in diuersas partes declinationis separantur... .

The manuscript reading with two instances of *pronuntiativo* is very convenient for explaining why the underlined words are missing from the manuscript M: a case of simple *saut du même au même*. However, the restored reading does not make a lot of sense. The text in Keil's edition of the *Explanationes*, 'there are verbs sharing an identical form in the indicative which are then separated in the perfect tense...', is odd, as mood obviously makes no difference in choosing the verbal stem for each verb form (e.g., *facio/faciam* or *fecit/fecisset*). This must be an oversight on Keil's part; the manuscript L most likely had this reading, and the same reading may have contributed to the omission in M. Still the reading *pronuntiativo* must be emended to *praesenti* for this section to make proper sense.

The verbs that exemplify the issue of verbs with similar present-tense forms and dissimilar perfect-tense forms are *pando* and *sero*. There is a discrepancy between the reading of the manuscript M and that of the *Explanationes*; the reading in M is *serui*, whereas the *Explanationes* has *sevi*. I have kept the reading of the manuscript M, *serui*,¹²⁷ although the form *sevi* is more prevalent in the corpus of Late Latin grammars.

The last few lines of this section (XI, 65–66) also suffer from some textual problems, which can, happily, be resolved in a reasonably satisfactory manner. The *Explanationes* (GL 4: 557, 13–14) provides the reading “*item contraria, quae a diversis praesentibus venientia*”; this reading helps us to restore the words omitted from M (XI, 65) with some confidence.

¹²⁶ GL 6: 200, 21–23: “*Quae sunt verba quae in tempore praesenti indicativo modo dissimilia in praeterito similia fiunt? Vi cerno et cresco, quae faciunt crevi. item polleo et polluo faciunt pollui.*”

¹²⁷ Searching the CGL database, I ended up with 34 instances of *serui*. However, most instances were forms of the noun *seruus*, and some were instances of the imperative form of the verb *seruio*. Only in nine instances can the form *serui* be interpreted as a perfect-tense verb form. One of these instances is particularly close to the passage under scrutiny, namely Consentius GL 5: 384 22–26. See n. 123 above.

3.9 De participio

First, I will briefly return to comment on the order in which the parts of speech are presented in this grammar. The chapter on the participle follows that on the verb in the *APS*, and the discussion on the adverb comes after the participle, unlike in Donatus' works, where the chapter on the adverb follows the treatment of the verb. In the *APS*, as in the works of Charisius and Diomedes, for instance, the inflecting parts of speech (the noun, the pronoun, the verb, and the participle) precede the non-inflecting ones (the adverb, the preposition, the conjunction, and the interjection). Law regards this order as proof that the *APS* was compiled before Donatus' grammars gained popularity: "Donatus popularised the order *nomen pronomen uerbum aduerbium participium coniunctio praepositio interiectio*, and from the end of the fourth century this sequence held sway almost unchallenged. ... In view of the speed with which the order favoured by Donatus was adopted after the appearance of his grammars, it is reasonable to assume that M [the *APS*] is not significantly later than Donatus' *floruit* (s. IV med.)" (1987: 82–83). The situation in the late third to late fourth century grammars varies. Law (1987: 82) lists Charisius,¹ Diomedes,² Dositheus,³ Victorinus,⁴ Ps.-Palaemon,⁵ and Ps.-Augustine⁶ among the grammarians who keep the inflecting parts of speech together, treating them before the non-inflecting ones. The earliest Latin grammars preserved in any substantial length, that is, Sacerdos' grammar and Ps.-Probus' *Instituta artium*, have yet a different order of presenting the parts of speech.⁷ Several late fourth to sixth century grammatical works are commentaries on Donatus' *artes*, and as such these works would naturally treat the parts of speech in the same order as Donatus, thus cementing the order used in his works as the standard one (see Holtz 1981: 68). In his *Institutiones* Priscian departs from the order used by

¹ *Nomen, pronomen, uerbum, participium, aduerbium, coniunctio, praepositio, and interiectio.*

² *Nomen, pronomen, uerbum, participium, aduerbium, praepositio, coniunctio, and interiectio.*

³ *Nomen, pronomen, uerbum, participium, aduerbium, praepositio, coniunctio, and interiectio.*

⁴ (*Nomen*), *uerbum, (pronomen), participium, aduerbium, coniunctio, praepositio, and interiectio.*

⁵ *Nomen, pronomen, uerbum, participium, aduerbium, and praepositio.*

⁶ According to Law (1987: 82 n. 49), "Only one copy of this text, Oxford Bodl. Addit. C. 144 (Italy, s. xi), preserves the original order; the version printed by Keil, based on Clm 6281 and the *editio princeps*, follows the normalised sequence found in all other manuscripts." The 2011 edition of the *Regulae Ps.-Augustini* by Martorelli adopts the order *nomen, pronomen, uerbum, participium, aduerbium, coniunctio, praepositio, and interiectio.*

⁷ The *Instituta artium*: *nomen, pronomen, participium, coniunctio, interiectio, praepositio, aduerbium, and uerbum.* Sacerdos' grammar (which has been transmitted to us in an acephalous state) treats the parts of speech in the following order: (...) *praepositio, uerbum, aduerbium, participium, coniunctio, and interiectio.* Holtz (1981: 66–68) thinks that the order occurring in the grammar of Sacerdos is the first extant example of the adverb following the verb. Donatus did not, according to Holtz, invent the order used in his *artes*; most likely it existed already before him (1981: 68). The order Holtz considers the oldest in Latin grammars is the one occurring also in the *APS*, with the inflecting parts of speech treated first, and *praepositio* preceding *coniunctio*, which is the last part of speech in the corresponding Greek list (1981: 67).

Donatus by treating the inflecting parts of speech first,⁸ but he relies on Greek sources⁹ in justifying the order used in his grammar.

Next, I will turn to the definition of the participle. This definition underwent very little change with the introduction of the new, essential definitions in the third and fourth centuries (Luhtala 2002: 279). Although Donatus mostly seems to avoid etymological components in his definitions, he included such a component in his definition of the participle, “*Participium est pars orationis, dicta quod partem capiat nominis partemque uerbi*” (*Ars maior*, 644, 2H).¹⁰ The inclusion of an etymological element could, perhaps, be related to the problems ancient grammarians seem to have in finding a distinguishing semantic feature for the participle.¹¹ There were various solutions to this problem: the definition of the participle could consist of merely formal features, as evidenced by a definition in the grammar of Charisius (who is quoting Cominianus here), “*participium est pars orationis cum tempore et casu*” (232, 10–11B).¹² Although this brief definition does separate the participle successfully from the other parts of speech, few grammarians are content with it, preferring to include an etymological component in their definition or a separate etymological definition after the formal one,¹³ as also Cominianus proceeds to do: “*participium autem dictum videtur, quod partem capiat nominis partemque verbi. trahit enim casum a nomine, tempus a verbo*” (232, 11–13B).

⁸ Priscian treats the inflecting parts of speech in the following order: *nomen, uerbum, participium*, and *pronomen*.

⁹ See, e.g., *GL* 3: 24, 2–8: “*quoniam de omnibus, ut potui, declinabilibus supra disserui, id est de nomine et verbo et participio et pronomine, nunc ad indeclinabilia veniam, quae iure extrema ponuntur: ea enim sine illis sententiam complere non possunt, illa vero sine istis saepissime complent. itaque cum mihi bene videantur praepositionem ceteris indeclinabilibus Graecorum doctissimi praeposuisse, et maxime Apollonius, cuius auctoritatem in omnibus sequendam putavi, ego quoque ab ea incipiam*”, and *GL* 2: 548, 2–7: “*qui tertio loco participium posuerunt, rectius fecisse videntur. cum enim nomen et verbum primum et secundum tenuerunt locum, participium, quod ex utroque nascitur, sequentem iure exigit. quaesitum est tamen, an bene separaverint id ab aliis partibus grammatici et primus Trypho, quem Apollonius quoque sequitur, maximus auctor artis grammaticae.*”

¹⁰ “The participle is a part of speech which is so called, because it takes a part from the noun and a part from the verb.”

¹¹ The part of the essential definition which conclusively sets apart a part of speech from the others is the so-called *proprium*. Cf. the opinion of Marius Victorinus concerning the parts of the essential definition: “*Sed ... in definitione ... proprium plurimum valet*” (Stangl 339, 2–5). In the definition of the noun it can be, e.g., “*corpus aut rem proprie communiterue significans*”, or in that of the verb “*aut agere aliquid aut pati aut neutrum significans*.” The distinguishing feature of the participle would actually be similar to that of the verb, as a definition found in Charisius’ grammar suggests (230, 2–4B): “*Participium est pars orationis cum tempore et casu sine persona active vel passive aliquid significans, ut limans legens.*” However, having two parts of speech with the same distinguishing feature would create problems for the system of the eight parts of speech, as the status of the participle as an independent part of speech would come under question.

¹² “The participle is a part of speech with a tense and a case.”

¹³ See also Sacerdos: “*Participium est pars orationis cum tempore et casu. participium dictum est, quod partem recipiat a nomine, partem a verbo*” (*GL* 6: 443, 17–18). Ps.-Probus begins his treatment of the participle with one of his truncated definitions, followed by an etymological definition: “*Participium est pars orationis. participium autem dictum, quod partem capiat nominis et partem verbi. recipit enim a nomine genus et casum, a verbo qualitatem et tempus, ab utroque numerum figuram et accentum*” (*GL* 4: 138, 27–30). See also Dositheus: “*Participium est dictio originem trahens a nomine et a verbo cum tempore et casu et genere. participium autem dictum videtur, quod partem capiat nominis, partem verbi. participio accidunt a nomine genus et casus, a verbo qualitas et tempus, ab utroque numerus et figura*” (38, 3–7Bo). The definition of the participle found in Charisius’ grammar (230, 2–4B) (see n. 11) is the only one that I could find with no references to etymological elements (*partem capiens/dicta quod partem accipit*).

The definition of the participle occurring in the *APS* (XII, 3–4) is unique in the corpus of Latin grammatical texts as regards its wording: “*Participium est pars orationis, quae per se quidem nihil ualet, nisi a nomine et a uerbo partem acceperit.*”¹⁴ This definition underlines the status of the participle as a part of speech dependent on the noun and the verb, with, it seems, no distinguishing characteristic other than its dependence on the two principal parts of speech.¹⁵ A familiar-sounding etymological definition follows the first definition (XII, 4–6): “*Nam participium dictum <est>, quod partem nominis, partem uerbi capiat. Trahit enim a nomine genus et casum, a uerbo significationem et tempus, ab utroque numerum et figuram.*”¹⁶

In the *APS* the definition is not followed by a list of the *accidentia* of the participle,¹⁷ although four properties are then discussed in the following order: *genus*, *significatio*, *numerus*, and *figura*. This could, perhaps, be due to an omission by a copyist, but most grammarians do not list or discuss all the properties of the participle as faithfully as Donatus does.¹⁸ Nor do all grammarians even discuss the participle within the framework of the *accidentia*; some grammarians seem more interested in, e.g., the various endings of participles,¹⁹ the issue of homonymous participles and nouns,²⁰ or participles originating from nouns.²¹ This type of material does not fit into the framework of the *accidentia*, and thus Donatus lists such features at the end of his chapter on the

¹⁴ “The participle is a part of speech which has no meaning of its own apart from that which it receives from the noun and verb.”

¹⁵ In most grammars the status of the participle as a separate part of speech was not questioned. However, in his *Institutiones* Priscian debates whether the participle should be considered a separate part of speech due to its heavy dependence on the principal parts of speech, the noun and the verb. See, e.g., *GL* 2: 548, 14–549, 6: “*sic igitur supra dicti philosophi etiam participium aiebant appellationem esse reciprocam, id est ἀντανάκλαστον προσήγορίαν, hoc modo: legens est lector et lector legens, cursor est currens et currens cursor, amator est amans et amans amator, vel nomen verbale vel modum uerbi casualem. unde uidentur nostri ascribere inter uerba gerundia uel participialia, cum uideantur ea diuersos assumere casus. ideo autem participium separatim non tradebant partem orationis, quod nulla alia pars orationis semper in derivatione est nullam propriam positionem habens, nisi participium; ceterae enim partes primo in positione inventae sunt, ad quam etiam derivativa aptantur.*” He eventually decides for the affirmative, as also the remaining five parts of speech rely on the two principal ones: “*nec solum participium non ab aliqua propria ui, sed ab affinitate nominis et uerbi nominatum est, sed aliae quoque quinque partes orationis non a sua ui, sed ab adiunctione, quam habent ad nomen uel uerbum, uocabulum acceperunt: pronomen enim dicitur, quod pro nomine ponitur, et aduverbium, quod uerbo adiungitur, et praepositio, quae tam nomini quam uerbo praepositur, et coniunctio, quae coniungit ea, et interiectio, quae his interiacet. unde est dicendum, quod, si non sit nomen et uerbum, nec alia pars orationis constare poterit*” (*GL* 2: 551, 10–18).

¹⁶ “The participle is called thus, because it takes a part both from both the noun and the verb: it receives a gender and a case from the noun, a voice and a tense from the verb, and number and composition from both.”

¹⁷ The *accidentia* are listed in all the chapters discussing parts of speech except here and in the chapters on the preposition and the interjection. Unlike the participle, the interjection and the preposition only have one *accidens*, and thus in both these chapters the discussion on the *accidentia* may have been left out on purpose. The participle, on the other hand, has more properties: Donatus lists all six, “*participio quot accidunt? sex. quae? genera, casus, tempora, significationes, numerus, figura*” (597, 7–8H).

¹⁸ Dositheus, for instance, discusses only four *accidentia*, in the same order as the *APS*: *genus*, *qualitas* [= *significatio*], *numerus*, and *figura*.

¹⁹ See, e.g., Audax (*GL* 7: 349, 4–8).

²⁰ See, e.g., the *Ars breuiata* of Augustine (VI §2W) or Victorinus (*GL* 6: 200, 27–201, 6).

²¹ See, e.g., Victorinus (*GL* 6: 201, 11–12).

participle in the *Ars maior*.²² In her dissertation, Louise Visser (2010: 47–79) analyzes the situation in the various commentaries on Donatus’ works, but the situation concerning the *accidentia* (which are discussed and which are not) is very different in the commentaries, as they were ultimately meant to be studied along with Donatus’ grammars, so the information missing in a commentary could be found there.

The first property that the author of the *APS* discusses is gender (*genus*). In the various accounts of the participle, *genus* is always mentioned as a feature tracing its origin to the noun, not to the verb, although the term *genus* was in use in the discussion on the verb as well. There is a problem in this section in the manuscript, as the beginning of the passage reads: “*Genera participiis accidunt nomina*” (XII, 7). My emendation of *nomina* to *omnia* is naturally only one of several possibilities. However, this is not the only problem occurring in the section on gender; only the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders are mentioned, along with examples for these three genders (*factus, facta, factum*). Normally, the common gender, *genus commune*, which is in some grammars termed *omne*,²³ is also included in the discussions on gender, as only the past and future participles have a different form for all three genders. The present participle forms (of the type *faciens*) should be listed under the common gender, but there is no mention at all of this gender in the *APS*. This could be due to an omission at some stage of the transmission of the text. Certainly, as it stands, this passage (XII, 7–8) is an incomplete description of gender in participles. No other grammar discussing the *accidens genus* leaves out the crucial information on the existence of the common gender, which covers all the present-tense participles.²⁴

Case (*casus*) is often not treated with much enthusiasm in the discussions on the participle, as their inflection follows that of nouns.²⁵ In the *APS* *casus* is merely an afterthought in the section on gender: “... *subiunctis scilicet omnibus casibus suis*” (XII, 8).²⁶

²² See Holtz (1981: 92ff.) for a discussion on this tendency in Donatus’ works.

²³ The term *genus omne* is used in, for instance, book 1 of the *Explanaciones* of Ps.-Sergius (GL 4: 513, 13–14) and Servius’ commentary (GL 4: 416, 33). Ps.-Probus’ *Instituta artium* includes both *genus commune* and *omne* in the list of *genera participiorum* (GL 4: 138, 33), but no examples are given for either type, so it is hard to say what exactly is referred to with the terms *commune* and *omne* in that instance.

²⁴ If this issue (*genus*) is treated in any detail, the common gender is always mentioned (as *genus commune* or *omne*). Some grammars do not discuss the *accidens genus* at all, or merely refer to the discussion on *genus* in nouns, as Diomedes does: “*genera et casus ex nomine tracta facile noscimus*” (GL 1: 401, 24–25). Some grammatical texts, as mentioned already above, do not discuss all the *accidentia* of the participle, but even then the fact that only the present participle belongs to the common gender might be mentioned, as happens in the commentary by Cledonius (GL 5: 23, 1–4): “*Tribus generibus, ut hic et haec et hoc legens: participia omnia temporis praesentis, quae veniunt ab activis et neutralibus verbis vel a deponentibus vel a communibus, semper generis sunt omnis.*”

²⁵ See Donatus, *Ars maior*: “*casus totidem sunt participiorum, quot et nominum*” (644, 9H), Diomedes: “*genera et casus ex nomine tracta facile noscimus*” (GL 1: 401, 24–25), or Sacerdos: “*casus in participiis tot sunt, quot et in nominibus et in pronomibus*” (GL 6: 443, 28–29).

²⁶ “All of which [genders] are subordinated to their own inflectional paradigms.”

The next property discussed by the author of the *APS* is voice (*significatio*). Although the text of the *APS* states that “*Significatio participiorum, ita ut uerborum, in species diuiditur quinque*” (XII, 9),²⁷ in the section on verbs this property (‘voice’) is called *genus*, not *significatio*.²⁸ This is due to the fact that the term *genus* was already in use in the discussion on the participle, where it signifies grammatical gender. Apparently, when confronted with the two competing uses of *genus* both of which featured in participles, the grammarians considered the use of the term *genus* as ‘grammatical gender’ as the principal one,²⁹ and used an alternative term, *significatio*,³⁰ to refer to the phenomenon that in verbs was usually termed *genus*.

Five voices are listed in the *APS*, as is usual, that is, active, passive, neuter, common, and deponent verbs, with examples for all the different types of participles derived from these five types of verbs. The list of participles as a whole does not offer any novelties as regards the doctrine it presents, but the terminology used for some of the tenses is interesting. The present tense is referred to as (*tempus*) *instans* in this list (XII, 10ff.); elsewhere, the use of this term is mostly restricted to the grammars of Charisius, Diomedes, and Ps.-Probus,³¹ where it always appears in conjunction with the more usual term, (*tempus*) *praesens*.³² In the section on the verb (XI, 33–36), the term (*tempus*) *praesens*³³ is used instead of (*tempus*) *instans*, which may indicate the use of different sources for these two sections.

The term used for the other ‘future’ participle (of the type *legendus*)³⁴ is not attested elsewhere in Late Latin grammars. Whereas other grammarians use the term (*participium*) *futuri* (*temporis*) for future participles derived from both active and passive verbs,³⁵ in the *APS* a

²⁷ XII, 9: “The voice of participles, like that of verbs, can be divided into five subcategories.”

²⁸ XI, 9–10: “*Genera uerborum sunt quinque: actiuum, passiuum, neutrum, commune, deponens, quod et simplex dicitur.*”

²⁹ This is understandable as *genus* meaning ‘grammatical gender’ is closer to the original meaning of the word *genus* as ‘birth’ or ‘descent’, which evokes in mind the biological genders, the masculine and the feminine. Cf. Pompey (*GL* 5: 159, 23–27): “*Varro ait genera tantum illa esse quae generant: illa proprie dicuntur genera. quodsi sequemur auctoritatem ipsius, non erunt genera nisi duo, masculinum et femininum. nulla enim genera creare possunt nisi haec duo. illa vero alia abusive genera nominamus, id est nomine tantum sunt genera, non natura.*”

³⁰ *Significatio* can also refer to voice/diathesis in verbs (see s.v. *significatio* in Schad 2007), and some grammarians mention *significatio* along with *genus*, e.g., Donatus: “*genera uerborum, quae ab aliis significationes dicuntur, sunt quinque: actiua, passiuu, neutra, deponentia, communia*” (*Ars maior*: 635, 5–6H). Dositheus uses only *significatio* in his chapter on the verb: “*significationes uerborum V: actiua passiuu neutra deponens communis*” (34, 13–14Bo). For the same phenomenon in participles, confusingly, he uses the term *qualitas* instead of *significatio*: “*qualitas participiorum sicut uerborum: aut enim agentia sunt aut patientia aut communia aut neutra aut deponentia*” (38, 11–13Bo).

³¹ The term is used, to a lesser extent, in Sacrosancti, Priscian’s, and Pompeius’ works. See Schad (2007: s.v. *instans*).

³² [*Probi*] *Instituta artium, de uerbo*: passim: “... *temporis praesentis siue instantis*”.

³³ XI, 33–34: “*Tempora uerbis accidunt tria: praesens, praeteritum, futurum; praesens, ut lego, praeteritum, ut legi, futurum, ut legam*”.

³⁴ This type is not nowadays classed as a participle, but it was considered a future participle derived from passive verbs by most Late Latin grammarians.

³⁵ *Ars maior* (644, 13–15H): “*Veniunt enim participia a uerbo actiuo duo, praesentis temporis et futuri, ut legens lecturus: a passiuo duo, praeteriti temporis et futuri, ut lectus legendus*”.

distinction is made between the two types: active future participles are called (*participia*) *futuri* (*temporis*), and passive future participles are referred to as (*participia*) *plusquamfuturi* (*temporis*).³⁶

No separate discussion of tense (*tempus*) in participles is included in the discussion in the *APS*. Such a discussion may have seemed superfluous, as examples of participles of each tense were already incorporated into the discussion on *significatio*. In her study Visser (2010: 49ff.) also mentions the tendency in the commentaries on Donatus' *artes* to leave out the treatment of particular *accidentia*, such as tense.

What follows the discussion on voice is a note on the confusion existing in the use of active, passive, and neuter verbs,³⁷ particularly as regards the types of participles formed from these verbs. Although no close parallels to this passage (XII, 17–19) can be found in other Latin grammars, some grammarians do comment on the past participles formed from neuter verbs (that is, intransitive verbs).³⁸ First, the author of the *APS* mentions *potus sum* and *natandus est fluius* as examples of active and neuter verbs used incorrectly.³⁹ Then he proceeds to list passive verbs that have, in his opinion, wrongly given rise to active participles, such as *annus uertens* and *terra mouens*.⁴⁰ *Potare* ('to drink') is considered by the author an active (i.e., transitive) verb from which the present participle *potans* ('drinking') and future participle *potaturus* (or *poturus*) ('drinking in the future') could thus be formed. Naturally, from an active verb a passive form could be derived, which, in turn, would have a passive participle, *potatus* (or *potus*) ('having been drunk'), and another future participle, *potandus* ('to be drunk in the future'). The situation is, however, not as clear-cut as the Late Latin grammarians would hope. *Potare* could be used as both a transitive and an intransitive verb.⁴¹ In addition, the past participle *potus* had acquired both active and passive uses. Similar problems exist as regards the verb *natare* ('to swim'); this intransitive verb had developed some transitive uses,⁴² and some passive forms can also be found.⁴³ Thus, perhaps

³⁶ XII, 12: "... *plusquamfuturi, ut legendus*".

³⁷ What are referred here to as active, passive, and neuter verbs are nowadays considered transitive verbs in their active and passive forms (*actiua/passiua*) and intransitive verbs (*neutra*).

³⁸ Cf. Servius (*GL* 4: 417, 37ff.). Servius mentions past participles derived from neuter verbs, but cautions against the use of such participles unless they can be found in the works by suitable authors. Also Pompey (*GL* 5: 262, 17ff.) remarks on this issue and, like Servius, speaks against forming such participles on one's own, without recourse to *auctoritas*: "*quid ergo? licebit nobis ad istam similitudinem etiam alia facere? ne forte dicas mihi, et mihi datur potestas ut, ubi voluerim, in verbo neutro faciam tale participium et dicam carere origine, ut si dicas natatus, 'natatus est mihi amnis', ut si dicas 'dormitum est mihi illud tempus'. utrum possum dicere 'meridiatus sum illa re'? ... utrum possum usurpare ista participia ad similitudinem illius usurpationis? et scire debemus quoniam non possumus penitus. ... ista omnia quae dicimus usurpativa sunt. si ergo usurpativa sunt, iam artem non habent; si artem non habent, debemus saltim vel auctoritatem sequi*" (*GL* 5: 263, 11ff.).

³⁹ XII, 17–18: "*consuetudo nonnumquam actiuum et neutrum cum passiuo confundit, ut 'potus sum' cum dicimus et 'natandus est fluius'*".

⁴⁰ XII, 18–19: "*et nonnumquam passiuum in actiuum transfigurat, ut 'annus uertens', 'terra mouens'.*"

⁴¹ Cf., e.g., *vinum potat* and "*Si potare velit...*" (Cic. *Brut.* 288).

⁴² Cf., e.g., "... *natabat aquas*" (Mart. 14.196.2).

unsurprisingly, also the passive future participle (*natandus*) could be formed. This is in clear violation of the system of participle formation the author has just described. The case is much the same for the examples *annus uertens* and *terra mouens*. *Mouere* ('to move (something)') as a transitive verb takes a direct object,⁴⁴ and the passive form *moueri* or the active form with a reflexive pronoun *se* is used to express when someone or something moves (oneself/itself).⁴⁵ Sometimes *mouere* is attested as an intransitive verb with the meaning 'to move (itself)',⁴⁶ and thus usage such as *terra mouens* ('the shaking earth') can also be found. The case of *uerto* ('to turn') is more complicated: it can be used both as a transitive⁴⁷ and an intransitive verb ('to turn/change (oneself)').⁴⁸ Problems arise when also the passive form can be used to express the same (to turn/change themselves).⁴⁹ Thus the example quoted above, *annus uertens*⁵⁰ ('the turning year'/'the course of a year'), is considered erroneous by the author of the *APS*, who would prefer to separate the two meanings, 'to turn something' and 'to turn oneself', neatly into the active and passive uses of the same transitive verb.

The problem of homonymous past participles and nouns is discussed in many Late Latin grammars;⁵¹ many grammarians also cite the exact same examples (*cultus* and *uisus*) in their discussions on this matter.⁵² The features that set the nouns and participles apart are, according to Late Latin grammarians, their paradigm and tense,⁵³ but the latter feature is not discussed in the *APS*. Past participles belong to the second declension, while the homonymous nouns belong to the fourth declension. Terminology referring to the declensions is not used anywhere in the *APS*, although it does occur in later grammarians' works.⁵⁴ Unlike the *APS*, some grammars also include

⁴³ Cf., e.g., "*quot piscibus unda natatur*" (Ov. *Tr.* 5.2.25).

⁴⁴ E.g., "*signum non posset movere loco*" (Cic. *Div.* 1.77).

⁴⁵ E.g., "*priusquam hostes moverentur*" (Liv. 37.19.18) and "*praecepit eis, ne se ex eo loco moverent*" (Liv. 34.20.5).

⁴⁶ E.g., "*terra dies duodequadrageinta movit*" (Liv. 35.40.7).

⁴⁷ E.g., "*(luna) ... eam partem ... ad speciem vertit nobis*" (Lucr. 5, 723–724).

⁴⁸ E.g., "*iam verterat fortuna*" (Liv. 5.49.5).

⁴⁹ E.g., "*Vertitur interea caelum...*" (Verg. *Aen.* 2.250).

⁵⁰ E.g., "*anno vertente sine controversia (petisses)*" (Cic. *Quinct.* 40).

⁵¹ XII, 20–21. See also Charisius' grammar (where he is citing Cominianus, 232, 24–29B), Donatus' *Ars maior* (646, 5–6H), Dositheus' work (38, 19–22Bo), Diomedes' grammar (*GL* 1: 402, 25–29), Victorinus' grammar (*GL* 6: 200, 27–201, 6), Ps.-Probus' *Instituta artium* (*GL* 4: 142, 23–29), Sacerdos' grammar (*GL* 6: 443, 35–444, 2), the *Ars Bobiensis* (24, 8–10D), the *Ars breuiata* (VI §2W), Cledonius' work (*GL* 5: 72, 18–20), Pompey's commentary (*GL* 5: 257, 1–8), Servius' commentary (*GL* 4: 441, 16–18), Ps.-Sergius' *Explanationes I* (*GL* 4: 515, 7–11).

⁵² *Passus*, *uisus*, and *cultus* are the most often cited examples of this phenomenon.

⁵³ See Donatus: "*sunt multa participia eadem et nomina, ut passus, uisus, cultus, quae tamen et in casibus discrepant et de temporibus dinoscuntur*" (646, 5–6H).

⁵⁴ Cf. Pompey: "... *quod, quando est participium, secundae declinationis est; quando autem est nomen, quartae declinationis est*" (*GL* 5: 257, 7–8). Earlier grammars express the matter in a less precise way. See Sacerdos: "*quorum quidem species genetiuo dinoscitur, ut cultus, si sit nomen, huius cultus faciet, si participium temporis praeteriti, huius culti*" (*GL* 6: 444, 1–2) and Ps.-Probus: "*quibus hoc monemus, ut tunc haec intellegi debeant nomina, quando ad exemplum fluctus per casus reperiuntur esse declinata, quoniam omnia participia praeteriti temporis ad docti formam necesse est per casus esse pronuntianda*" (*GL* 4: 142, 26–29).

examples of homonymous present participles and nouns.⁵⁵

The discussion on number in participles is brief and straightforward, as is the case with most grammars that treat the subject.⁵⁶

The issue of frequentative verbs (and thus also participles) is more often discussed in the section on the verb (see, e.g., XI, 26–27). However, in the *APS* the issue is discussed under the *accidens numerus*⁵⁷ in the section on the participle as well. This type of information also appears in the discussion on the participle in the grammar of Charisius (231, 4–7B), but that passage is not integrated into the framework of the *accidentia*.⁵⁸ Diomedes' grammar boasts a rather more elegant solution of incorporating the information under the *accidens qualitas*.⁵⁹

The brief discussions on composition (*figura*) show little variation in the corpus of Late Latin grammars. The examples cited in the *APS* are derived from the verb *legere*, which is also used by other grammarians on this point.⁶⁰ The participle given as an example of a *participium compositum*, *perlegens*, is cited as an example of such a participle also by Ps.-Sergius in book 1 of the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 514, 36).⁶¹

The last issue to be discussed in the section on the participle is the matter of nouns resembling participles (XII, 28–31). The origin of these words cannot be traced back to a verb. The examples cited in the *APS* are *togatus*, *galeatus*,⁶² and *hastatus*. The sentiment among the Late Latin

⁵⁵ See, e.g., Sacerdos: “*nam sapiens tempore participium. comparatione nomen declaratur: nam si fecerit futuro tempore sapientur, sapiens participium est; si fecerit sapiens sapientior sapientissimus, nomen est*” (GL 6: 444, 2–5).

⁵⁶ XII, 22: “*Numeri participiis accidunt duo: singularis, ut hic currens, pluralis, ut hi currentes*”. Priscian has the same examples (GL 2: 568, 12), *currens* and *currentes*, but obviously this is due to a coincidence and is not proof of any connection between these two texts.

⁵⁷ XII, 23–24: “*Item aut semel quid agi participia significant, ut legens, currens, aut saepius, ut lectitans, cursitans.*” There is also a similar, brief mention on frequentative verbs in the chapter on the verb. In both instances the term *frequentativus* (or *iterativus*) is absent.

⁵⁸ 231, 4–7B: “*Participia sicut uerba interdum semel, interdum saepius agere quid significant, et quidem praeteriti temporis lectitatus, praesentis lectitans, futuri lectitaturus.*”

⁵⁹ GL 1: 401, 19–22: “*Qualitas participiorum similiter quem ad modum in verbis in quattuor species distributa est, absoluta inchoativa frequentativa meditativa. absoluta est ut legens dicens, inchoativa ut ferverescens luciscens, frequentativa ut cursitans quaeritans, meditativa ut esuriens parturiens*”. The *accidens qualitas* is not attested in the discussion on the participle in the *APS*.

⁶⁰ *Legere* is also used in Donatus' *Ars minor* (and the commentary by Julian of Toledo): *legens, neglegens*. Ps.-Asper has *legens* and *relegens*. Words related to education, such as *legere*, *scribere*, *docere*, *tabula*, and so on, are used as examples by the author of the *APS* in his grammar on several occasions. This is also true of Donatus' grammars (Holtz 1981: 110). Holtz (1981: 110) remarks that this phenomenon is not restricted to Donatus' works: “Ces mots sont absolument de tous les temps et se retrouvent avec des variantes dans tous les autres manuels.”

⁶¹ This, in my view, is not an indication of any connection between these two chapters on the participle. See also the discussion in the introduction (chapter 1.4.) on the dependence of the (second book of the) *Explanationes* on this grammar.

⁶² The verb *galeare*, unlike **togare* and **hastare*, is actually attested in literature, although it is very rare. See “*milites in campo iubet galeari*” (Auct. B. Afr. 12 fin). Still, grammarians include *galeatus* among the examples for words incorrectly labelled as participles. See Charisius: “*sunt multa nomina quae speciem participiorum habeant, ut tunicatus galeatus. quae cum partem uerbi non habeant, non recte participia dicuntur*” (232, 21–24B). See also, e.g., Donatus

grammarians is mostly similar to the one expressed here: if the words are not derived from verbs, they cannot rightly be called participles.⁶³ The topic is a very popular one in Late Latin grammars, with many more examples for this phenomenon cited in most accounts.⁶⁴ Of these discussions only the ones appearing in Charisius⁶⁵ and Dositheus' grammars partly coincide with the passage in the *APS*.⁶⁶

The mention of Varro and Laberius in this section is intriguing; all the more so as the author of the *APS* does not generally name any of his sources.⁶⁷ Varro is obviously quite often referred to in Latin grammars, with over 500 hits on the name 'Varro' in the *CGL* database. But no other grammarians refer to Varro when discussing this particular problem. The instances of the name Laberius are naturally far fewer in Late Latin grammars; a mere 14 instances occur in the *CGL* database. No points of grammatical doctrine are attributed to him by any grammarian, which makes sense, keeping in mind that he is a writer, not a grammarian. Law (1987: 83 n. 51) notes that there are two extant Laberius fragments that contain the word *togata*.⁶⁸

Professor De Nonno suggests that the manuscript reading, *lauerius*, could also disguise a reference to the grammarian Valerius (Probus) (1st cent. AD).

(645, 12–13H), Diomedes (*GL* 1: 402, 23–25), Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 142, 33–37), Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 444, 6–7), the *Regulae* of Ps. Augustine (103, 18Ma), and Victorinus (*GL* 6: 201, 11–12).

⁶³ XII, 30–31: “*Sed cum partem a uerbo talia non habeant, non recte participia dicuntur*”. However, Servius' opinion (*GL* 4: 441, 3–10) concerning the words *tunicatus* and *galeatus* is that these words are, in fact, participles.

⁶⁴ This issue is treated in the *Ars maior* of Donatus (645, 13–14H: *tunicatus, galeatus*), in both the sources Charisius used in his chapter on the participle (231, 15–20B: *recens, frequens, decrepitus, hastatus, togatus, palliatus, barbatus* and 232, 21–24B: *tunicatus, galeatus*), in Diomedes' grammar (*GL* 1: 402, 21–23: *tunicatus, galeatus, penulatus, togatus*), in Sacerdos' work (*GL* 6: 444, 5–6: *tunicatus, galeatus, pudendus*), in the *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 142, 33–37: *tunicatus, galeatus, comatus*), in Dositheus' grammar (38, 18Bo: *tunicatus, galeatus*), in Victorinus' *ars grammatica* (*GL* 6: 201, 11–12: *comatus, galeatus, hastatus*), in the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (103, 16–20Ma: *tunicatus, galeatus, clipeatus, tropaeatus*), in Cledonius' work (*GL* 5: 71, 35–72, 4: *tunicatus, comatus, galeatus*), in Pompey's commentary (*GL* 5: 262, 11–17: *tunicatus, galeatus*), in Servius' in *Donati artem maiorem* (*GL* 4: 441, 3–10: *tunicatus, galeatus*, which Servius considers to be participles!), and in Priscian's *Institutiones* (*GL* 2: 562, 13–20 & 563, 7–8: *galeatus, scutatus, pilatus, tunicatus, manuleatus, caligatus, baccatus, paludatus, togatus, praetextatus, trabeatus, comatus, braccatus, paenulatus, soleatus, cristatus, hastatus, lunatus, stellatus, literatus, cerritus, turritus, pellitus, cornutus, astutus, hirsutus*).

⁶⁵ Charisius is quoting the grammar of Cominianus in this section.

⁶⁶ Cf. XII, 30–31 with 232, 22–24B and 38, 18–19Bo.

⁶⁷ He does mention *Varronis praecepta* in the chapter on the letter (III, 21–22). See also Holtz's discussion on Donatus' suppression of his sources and the names of the authors he quotes to exemplify points of grammatical doctrine (1981: 92). Of this tendency Holtz (1981: 92 n. 85) has the following opinion: “En fait, la tendance se manifestait déjà largement dans les sources de Donat. Elle est d'une façon générale latente en tout écrit technique et, plus largement encore, caractérise, sinon toute la littérature antique, du moins la littérature de l'époque tardive (on songe à Macrobe, qui ne nomme jamais Aulu-Gelle dans les *Saturnales*). Mais cette tendance atteint chez Donat ses conséquences ultimes: il y a ici l'expression d'un choix mûrement réfléchi.”

⁶⁸ See Bonaria (1965: 49).

3.10 De aduerbio

The definition begins the discussion on the adverb, as is the case with all the chapters on parts of speech in the *APS*. The definition occurring in the *APS*, “*Aduerbiū est pars orationis quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat aut mutat*” (XIII, 3–4),¹ is very similar to many other definitions surviving in Late Latin grammars, such as the one appearing in the fragments of Cominianus’ grammar and those appearing in Donatus’ grammars.² The verb *mutare* (‘to alter’) is not attested in any other extant definition of the adverb. By far the most common verbs used to describe the function of the adverb are *explanare* (‘to clarify’) and *implere* (‘to complete’), but other descriptions are also attested, such as *minuere* (‘to curtail’),³ *confirmare* (‘to affirm’), and *destruere* (‘to refute’).⁴ We need not therefore consider *mutat* as a corrupt reading in not agreeing exactly with the definitions quoted by Donatus or Charisius, for instance.

When compared, for example, to the definitions of the conjunction or the participle, there is more variation in the corpus of Latin grammarians in the definition of the adverb. However, two points arise in the majority of the definitions, namely the close ties the adverb shares with the verb (*adiecta uerbo*) and its function in completing the meaning expressed by the verb (e.g., *significationem/uim eius ... implet*).⁵ Etymological definitions – that is, those formulated along the

¹ “The adverb is a part of speech which is added to the verb to clarify or alter its meaning.”

² Cominianus (Char. 233, 2–3B): “*Aduerbiū est pars orationis quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius implet atque explanat*”, Donatus (*Ars maior* 640, 2–3H): “*Aduerbiū est pars orationis quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat atque implet, ut iam faciam uel non faciam*”, and *Ars minor* (595, 25H): “*Aduerbiū quid est? Pars orationis quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat atque implet.*” Several somewhat diverging definitions from the late third century and fourth century have also been transmitted to us, such as Sacerdos’ definition: “*Aduerbiū est pars orationis, quam uerbis adiciendo eorum significationem complemus*” (*GL* 6: 442, 15–16), the definition appearing in the *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus: “*Aduerbiū est pars orationis*” (*GL* 4: 150, 29), the definition used by Ps.-Asper: “*Aduerbiū est pars orationis quae uerbi vim explicat, ut scribo bene*” (*GL* 5: 551, 36), Augustine’s definition: “*Aduerbiū est pars orationis uerbo adicienda*” (*V* § 1W), as well as the one occurring in Victorinus’ work: “*Aduerbiū quid est? Pars orationis quae adiecta uerbo manifestior et planior redditur, ut docte dixit, pulchre fecit*” (*GL* 6: 201, 14–15) ≈ Audax (*GL* 7: 347, 23ff.). Sacerdos’ definition differs in its wording from the definition that was to emerge as the standard one, although the content of the definition is much the same. Ps.-Probus’ truncated definition seems to bear out the hypothesis that essential definitions were a fairly new addition to Latin grammar in the early fourth century (Luhtala 2010: 233). Diomedes’ definition (*GL* 1: 403, 17–18) is similar to that appearing in Donatus’ grammars. Charisius’ discussion includes Cominianus’ definition of the adverb as well as three very similar versions of it (233, 2–3B, 233, 27–28B, 241, 21–22B, and 246, 19–20B). Also the *Regulae Ps.-Augustini* (113, 2–4Ma) includes a definition similar to that used by Donatus. The definition and the whole discussion (113–123Ma) are deemed to originate from a *Schulgrammatik*-type text (Martorelli 2011: xci). Many commentators of Donatus also preserve the definition used by him. The definition attributed to Q. Terentius Scaurus, preserved in Diomedes’ grammar (*GL* 1: 403, 20ff.): “*Scaurus ita definit, aduerbiū est modus rei dictionis ipsa pronuntiatione definitus, ut recte diligenter optime*”, differs significantly both in its form as well as its content from the definitions of the later Roman grammatical tradition.

³ Cledonius (*GL* 5: 62, 17): “*...aut complet aut minuit*”.

⁴ Servius (*GL* 4: 438, 11–12): “*aduerbiū plerumque confirmat uerbum, plerumque destruit: confirmat, ut ‘iam faciam’; destruit, ut ‘non faciam’.*”

⁵ See Swiggers & Wouters (2002: 296): “Le rapport entre l’adverbe et le verbe est généralement défini en termes de supplément sémantique.” There are different views among ancient grammarians as to whether this supplement was

lines of “*aduerbium dictum est...*” and not cast in the form of the essential definition (“*aduerbium est pars orationis...*”) – survive mostly in *regulae*-type grammars and grammatical commentaries.⁶ Typically, the author of the *APS* does not include an etymological definition of the adverb in his discussion.

Before listing the *accidentia* of the adverb, the author of the *APS* briefly discusses the origin of adverbs (XIII, 4–5), which either stem from themselves (“*suae positionis sunt*”/“*a se nascuntur*”) or are derived from other parts of speech (“*ab aliis transeunt*”). The passage in the *APS* is very close in its wording to, for instance, Cominianus’ account of the matter (Char. 233, 3–6B).⁷ This issue is discussed in a comparable passage also in the grammars of Victorinus (*GL* 6: 201, 15–18) and Audax (*GL* 7: 347, 24–27), albeit in a question-and-answer form. Other grammarians treat this issue in more detail; this is the case even in some shorter works, such as the *Ars maior* of Donatus, which includes a list containing each word class that can give rise to an adverb.⁸ At the extreme end of the spectrum is the discussion on the origin of adverbs in the *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 150, 29–153, 24), spanning several pages and listing in great detail all the types of adverbs derived from different word classes.

Next, the author of the *APS* lists the properties of the adverb. The properties occurring in the *APS*, *significatio*, *comparatio*, and *figura* (‘meaning’, ‘comparison’, ‘composition’), are attested also in the majority of Late Latin grammars. A similar list of properties is included in more than 10 other Late Latin *artes* as well as some of the grammatical commentaries.⁹ A few grammarians, however,

compulsory or not (see Schad 2007: s.v. *adverbium*). According to many commentators of Donatus it was not: “*verbo tamen non necesse est egere semper adverbio. nam possum dicere sic, legit. nunc enim et plena est elocutio, et adverbium tamen non invenitur*” (Servius *GL* 4: 438, 8–10). However, Ps.-Augustine, for instance, thinks that it is a compulsory supplement to the verb (105, 14–15Ma): “*Vides quia verborum plena significatio esse non potest, nisi fuerint adverbia coniuncta.*”

⁶ See, for instance, the *Regulae* Ps.-Augustini (105, 8–9Ma): “*Adverbium ideo dictum est, quia adhaeret verbo nec potest verbi vis significantius sonare, nisi iungatur adverbium*”, Cledonius (*GL* 5: 20, 29–30): “*Adverbium dictum est ideo, quod coniunctum verbo vim eius explanet aut impleat*”, or Servius (*GL* 4: 438, 7): “*Adverbium dictum est, quia necesse habet semper verbum sequi.*”

⁷ See also the discussions in Dositheus’ grammar (39, 3–5Bo) and the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (113, 6–8Ma).

⁸ Donatus’ *Ars maior* (640, 4–7H): “*Adverbia aut a se nascuntur, ut heri, hodie, nuper, aut ab aliis partibus orationis ueniunt: a nomine appellatiuo, ut doctus docte; a proprie, ut Tullius Tulliane; a uocabulo, ut ostium ostiatim; a pronomine, ut meam, tuam; a uerbo, ut cursim, strictim; a nomine et uerbo, ut pedetemptim; a participio, ut indulgens indulgenter.*” Diomedes’ *ars* incorporates a very similar passage (*GL* 1: 403, 26–32).

⁹ The other grammars containing a similar list of *accidentia* are: Sacerdos’ *ars grammatica* (*GL* 6: 442, 16), Cominianus’ fragments (Char. 233, 6–7B), another discussion incorporated into Charisius’ grammar (234, 1–2B), the grammar of Dositheus (39, 5–6Bo), Donatus’ *Ars maior* (641, 8H) and *Ars minor* (595, 26H), Diomedes’ *ars grammatica* (*GL* 1: 404, 3), Victorinus’ grammar (*GL* 6: 201, 18–19), the *Excerpta* of Audax (*GL* 7: 348, 6), the *Ars breuiata* of Augustine (V §1W), as well as the second discussion on the adverb (originating in a *Schulgrammatik*-type source) in the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (113, 5Ma), although *comparatio* is labelled *gradus* in this text.

have diverging lists of four or five properties, but these lists vary and each is unique to just one extant grammar.¹⁰

The list of the *accidentia* of the adverb is followed by the discussion on *significatio* ('meaning'), the first property of the adverb. This discussion takes up almost half of the chapter on the adverb in the *APS*. Such a discussion is found in some form in most discussions on the adverb in the Latin *Schulagrammatik*-type grammars, with some of the categories common to all discussions,¹¹ and some appearing only in a few grammars or just one text.¹² Altogether 38 different types of *significatio* can be found in the Late Latin grammars (Swiggers-Wouters 2002: 303).

The passage on *significatio* in the *APS* does not coincide exactly with any other extant grammar. The closest parallel to the *APS* can be found in the discussion on *significatio* by Cominianus: that passage presents the subtypes of *significatio* in largely the same order as the *APS* and also uses a similar formula to present them. The wording in Cominianus' discussion echoes that of the *APS*:¹³ "*significant enim tempus, ut heri nuper; locum, ut hic; numerum, ut...*" (233, 8ff.B). Many, if not most, discussions of *significatio* introduce the subtypes with a genitive instead,¹⁴ as does Donatus in his *Ars maior*: "*quia sunt aduerbia loci, ut hic; temporis, ut hodie ..., numeri, ut..., negandi, ut...*" (641, 9ff.H).

Nevertheless, the passage on *significatio* in the *APS* contains more subcategories than Cominianus' account and also more examples for most of the categories.¹⁵ The discussion in the *APS* boasts, for instance, the subcategory of personal adverbs (*aduerbia personalia*),¹⁶ adverbs of

¹⁰ Ps.-Probus adds *tempus* ('tense') to his list (*GL* 4: 153, 25); he gives the adverbs *hodie*, *heri*, and *cras* as examples of the *accidens tempus*. Ps.-Asper's list of *significatio*, *positio*, *figura*, *qualitas*, and *quantitas* (*GL* 5: 551, 37) is also unique. *Qualitas* and *quantitas* refer to the comparison of adverbs. *Positio* (exemplified by *qualiter* and *taliter*) seems to be connected to the *accidens ordo*, which appears in connection with the pronoun in some grammarians (for instance, Ps.-Asper and Diomedes). Priscian's list of *accidentia* is unique in containing the *accidens species*, which refers to an issue discussed also by most other grammarians, that is, whether an adverb is derived from another part of speech or not.

¹¹ E.g., the adverbs denoting place (*aduerbia loci*) or time (*aduerbia temporis*) (Swiggers-Wouters 2002: 304)

¹² E.g., "*alia terminationis, ut ilicet*" in Victorinus' grammar (*GL* 6: 201, 23) or "*alia alternationis, ut vicissim*" in Audax's work (*GL* 7: 348, 19). See Swiggers-Wouters (2002: 303).

¹³ Cf. XIII, 7ff.

¹⁴ Swiggers and Wouters (2002: 306) demonstrate the types of terminology used to present the subtypes: verbal periphrasis (the type used in the *APS*): "*aduerbium quod significat congregationem*", genitive of an abstract noun: "*aduerbium congregationis*", genitive of an agent noun: "*aduerbium communicantis*", gerund: "*aduerbium congregandi*", adjective: "*aduerbium congregatiuum*", and adverb: "*aduerbium congregatiue*". In addition to Cominianus (and the *APS*), also Diomedes partly presents the adverbs using verbal periphrasis.

¹⁵ The *APS* has up to eight examples per subcategory, whereas the discussion attributed to Cominianus only includes one or two examples per subtype.

¹⁶ This is the only kind of adverb in the *APS* in which an adjective is used to describe the type of adverb.

limitation (*aduerbia finitionem (significantia)*),¹⁷ and adverbs of swearing (*aduerbia iurationem (significantia)*), which do not occur in Cominianus' account.

In the section on *significatio* (XIII, 9), the manuscript reading *neumquam* has been emended to *numquam*, which is not a very common example in Late Latin grammars, but still suits the subtype of adverbs of negation.¹⁸ In the same passage (XIII, 10), I have added the adverb *quidni* to the category of adverbs signifying affirmation. The adverb had been, perhaps mistakenly, included in the list of adverbs of interrogation (XIII, 14). The discussion on demonstrative adverbs seems to contain two instances of the adverb *ecce*, one spelled out in full and another in an abbreviated form (*ec*).¹⁹ One possibility of emending the manuscript reading is to retain the abbreviated *ecce* and combine the following instance of *ecce* and the rather puzzling *illud* into one adverb, *eccillud*. This word is not attested in the *CGL* database. Such a word does, however, appear in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, where it is classed as an interjection.²⁰ The manuscript reading *quinam* has been corrected to *quidnam* (XIII, 14), which is attested in the list of interrogative adverbs also in Dositheus' work (40, 48Bo). The rare personal adverb, *equidem*, is more often attested in the chapter on the conjunction in Late Latin grammars;²¹ however, due to its ancient etymology, (*ego quidem* → *equidem*), it could be admitted in the category of personal adverbs (XIII, 16). According to the manuscript readings, there are two instances of comparative adverbs in the discussion on *significatio* (XIII, 18; 19). The first instance is probably due to some mistake, as the adverbs that follow are not usually attested among the adverbs of comparison (*etiam*, *uero*, and *plane*). Thus I have emended the first instance of *conparationem* to *confirmationem*, which, although plausible, is not an ideal solution, as there is already a subcategory for adverbs of affirmation (XIII, 10). It is nevertheless a better solution than having two instances of *conparationem*. I have had to mark two subcategories as corrupt passages (XIII, 19; 20), because they contain adverbs that are not attested (or at least not in such a combination) in any extant Latin grammar.

The discussion on ornamental adverbs (*aduerbia ornatiua*) that follows (XIII, 21ff.) also suffers from some textual problems. The passage (XIII, 21–23) is echoed in the *Explanationes* of Ps.-Sergius²² and in Victorinus' *Ars grammatica*.²³ The passage in Victorinus is the only instance of

¹⁷ After consulting the list in Swiggers-Wouters (2002: 303–304), it seems to me that this category is not attested elsewhere else in Late Latin grammars.

¹⁸ See Charisius' grammar (245, 1–4B): “*In adverbio numquam quaestio oritur negationis sit an temporis. utrumque videtur in se habere et negationem et tempus. neque enim aliud est numquam quam non.*”

¹⁹ See Lindsay (1915: s.v. *ecce*).

²⁰ Also *ecce*, *ecca*, and *eccum*, for instance, are categorized as interjections in the *OLD*. Obviously, modern word classes do not always coincide with the word classes in use in Late Antiquity.

²¹ In addition to the *APS* (XV, 8), also Donatus (647, 2H) and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 415, 32), for instance, include *equidem* among the *coniunctiones expletiuae*.

²² *GL* 4: 558, 19–23: “*Sunt quaedam aduerbia quae significationes non habent et sunt coniunctionibus similes, quae*

ornamental adverbs listed in Schad's *Lexicon* (2007: s.v. *ornativus*). The passage in the *APS* is very corrupt toward the end, and, while I was able to emend some of the corrupt examples (*dum*, *locorum*) with some confidence, the quotation illuminating their use has unfortunately been lost. Surprisingly, even with the help of the two relatively similar passages, the confusion cannot be solved completely. The passages occurring in the *Explanationes* and Victorinus' grammar differ somewhat from each other and also from the account appearing in the *APS*. The list of examples in the *APS* (XIII, 22–23) is very similar to the passage in the *Explanationes*, but the name of these adverbs (*aduerbia ornatiua*), for instance, only appears in Victorinus' work.

Some grammarians include a brief reference to indefinite and definite adverbs in their discussions on the adverb, as does, for instance, Donatus in his *Ars maior* (642, 4H). On lines 24–26, the author of the *APS* gives a brief account of definite and indefinite adverbs of place and time.²⁴ Some grammarians have integrated such a discussion into their treatment of *significatio*,²⁵ but others, such as Donatus and Audax (*GL* 7: 348, 24), make a separate reference to the matter after discussing *significatio*. In addition to definite and indefinite adverbs, Augustine even includes *aduerbia minus quam finita* in his account.²⁶

The short discussions on *comparatio* and *figura* in the *APS* coincide almost to the word with comparable discussions appearing in the grammars of Charisius, Dositheus, Diomedes, and Victorinus.

posita orationem inluminant, subtracta nihil sensui demunt, ut profecto tandem modo dum locorum gentium: Cicero inuectivis 'ubinam gentium sumus', Terentius 'minime gentium'."

²³ *GL* 6: 202, 5–10: "Dum, gentium, 'ad id locorum' cuius modi aduerbia esse dicemus? Ornativa, siquidem adposita orationem inluminant, ablata nihil sensui subtrahunt, ut cum dicimus mane dum, ubi gentium. 'Ad id locorum' cuius rei habet significationem? Et loci et temporis: significat enim 'eo usque': [exemplum] Salustius in Iugurtha de Mario 'tamen is ad id locorum talis vir'."

²⁴ The definite and indefinite adverbs of place are illustrated with the adverbs *hic*, *illic*, *ibi*, and *ubi* and *supra*, *ultra*, and *citra*. The definite and indefinite adverbs of time are illustrated with the adverbs *heri* and *hodie* and *frequenter* and *cottidie*. See Charisius' work (242, 26ff.B) for a much more detailed discussion, which includes, for instance, also all the examples used by the author of the *APS*. However, the divisions and the terminology used in this discussion diverge slightly from those appearing in the *APS*.

²⁵ Cf., e.g., Dositheus (40, 2Bo and 40, 6Bo).

²⁶ This category is exemplified with the adverbs *sic*, *tunc*, and *illic* (V §2W).

3.11 De praepositione

The definition of the preposition used in the *APS*, “*Praepositio est pars orationis, quae praeposita alii parti orationis significationem eius implet aut mutat, ut scribo, subscribo, describo*”,¹ is similar to several other definitions surviving from the fourth century onward.² Nevertheless, more variation can be found in the definitions of the preposition appearing in Late Latin grammars than in the definitions of the conjunction, for instance.³ The earliest surviving definition is that of Palaemon (quoted by Charisius): “*De praepositionibus Palaemon ita definit. praepositiones sunt dictae ex eo quod praeponantur tam casibus quam verbis*” (299, 14–16B).⁴ The etymological content⁵ of this definition is preserved in an abridged form (*praeposita*) also in the standard definition, which improves on the older, etymological one by adding a semantic element to the definition, namely the power to change or complete the meaning of a word.⁶

The properties of the preposition are not mentioned in the *APS*,⁷ but Donatus, for instance, mentions the single *accidens* of the preposition (*casus*).⁸ Whereas Donatus’ grammars often enumerate aspects of their doctrine, as also happens in conjunction with the cases joined to the preposition,⁹ the *APS* does so far less frequently. Stating how many items will be listed is in most

¹XIV, 3–4. “The preposition is a part of speech which is placed before another part of speech to complete or change its meaning, e.g., *scribo, subscribo*, and *describo*.”

² See Donatus (648, 4–5H): “*Praepositio est pars orationis, quae praeposita aliis partibus orationis significationem earum aut complet aut mutat aut minuit*”, Cominianus (Char. 298, 2–5B): “*praepositio est pars orationis quae praeposita alii parti orationis significationem eius immutat aut simplicem servat, ut scribo subscribo rescribo*”, Victorinus (*GL* 6: 203, 16–18): “*Praepositio quid est? Pars orationis quae praeposita aliis partibus orationis significationem earum aut immutat aut auget aut minuit, ut describo praescribo rescribo*”, and Dositheus (45, 2–4Bo): “*Praepositio est pars orationis, quae praeposita alii parti orationis significationem eius immutat aut implet aut implet aut simplicem servat, ut inscribo*.”

³ It seems that the standard definition of the preposition never became as widespread as that of the conjunction. Nevertheless, the etymological element, prompted by the very name of this word class, can be found in most definitions, for instance, in the one used by Audax: “*Praepositio quid est? Pars orationis quae praeponitur nominibus atque verbis*” (*GL* 7: 351, 25–352,1). Exceptions to this rule are the truncated definition appearing in the *Instituta artium* (*GL* 4: 147, 4), “*Praepositio est pars orationis*” and the definition appearing in Diomedes’ grammar (*GL* 1: 408, 26–27), “*Praepositio est pars orationis quae complexa aliam partem orationis significationem eius immutat* *”.

⁴ “Palaemon defines prepositions thus: prepositions are so called, because they are placed before nouns or verbs.”

⁵ Most of the commentators of Donatus include etymological definitions in their works, as does Servius (*GL* 4: 441, 35–442, 1): “*Praepositio est pars orationis dicta, quod in loquendo praeponitur. et haec est eius natura, puta ‘ante templum’: nemo dicit ‘templum ante’*”. See also the commentary by Pompey (*GL* 5: 269, 27ff.).

⁶ Although it is an essential definition in its form, the definition appearing in the late third century grammar of Sacerdos has a very different content compared to the definition that emerged as the standard one in the fourth century: “*Praepositio est pars orationis, quae praeposita casui quem regit vim suam tenet, postposita interdum perdit...*” (*GL* 6: 428, 29–30).

⁷ See the discussion on p. 177 n. 17 in chapter 3.9.

⁸ 649, 2H: “*Praepositioni accidit casus tantum*.” Donatus (651, 15–652,3H) and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 409, 5–7) also mention that some grammarians add order (*ordo*, e.g., *sine* vs. *tenus*) and composition (*figura*, e.g., *abs/absque*) among the properties of the preposition.

⁹ 649, 2–3H: “*casus namque in praepositionibus duo sunt, accusatiuus et ablatiuius*.”

cases probably only intended as a mnemonic device (Law 1996: 43–44). While in a few instances the author of the *APS* makes use of this device (e.g., III, 7ff., IX, 32), the important mnemonic aid of alphabetical order is not used in the *APS* (Law 1996: 44).¹⁰

Next, the issue of combining prepositions with nouns and verbs is treated. A distinction is made between prepositions that only occur with nouns (*casibus seruiunt*), such as *apud*, and ones that only occur with verbs (*seruiunt ... loquellis*),¹¹ such as *re-* (as in *refero*), and the remaining prepositions, which can do both, such as *ad* (as in *admove* and *ad urbem*). This issue is discussed by many Late Latin grammarians; see, for example, Charisius (298, 5–10B; 308, 3–8B).¹²

Then follows a long list containing the prepositions taking the accusative case and the ablative case. Such lists are found in most chapters treating the preposition, with some examples common to several grammars, but the list here coincides almost word for word with the one appearing in the *Explanationes in artem Donati*. The compiler of that text has made only one significant revision, that of prefacing the list with “*Scaurus praepositiones accusativi casus sic posuit...*” (GL 4: 562, 1).¹³ This replaces the phrase “*Accusatiui casus sunt hae*” (XIV, 11),¹⁴ which appears in the *APS*. Later, when the compiler quotes the list of the prepositions taking the ablative case, no such revision is apparently deemed necessary.¹⁵

There are some problems with the transmission of the *APS* in this passage, as often occurs with long lists of examples. Firstly, on line 11 in the text, I have corrected the manuscript reading *cis* to *uls*, which is in line with the text of the *Explanationes*.¹⁶ The same correction has been made again on line 14, where *cis prouinciam* was changed to *uls prouinciam*. Without this correction the preposition *cis* would appear twice in the list of examples (XIV, 14; 15). The addition of the preposition *cis* on line 12 is based on the text of the *Explanationes*.¹⁷

On line 11 there is another correction: the manuscript reading *penes* has been corrected to *pone*. A similar correction also took place on line 14. Not only does the phrase *pone fores* (‘behind

¹⁰ Although vowels, semivowels, and mute consonants are listed in the alphabetical order, for example, prepositions, which many grammars list in the alphabetical order, appear in a seemingly random order in the *APS*. See also, e.g., Ps.-Asper’s grammar (GL 5: 553, 33ff.). However, as Law maintains, alphabetical order is employed to a greater extent in grammars concerned with form, particularly the *regulae*-type grammars (1996: 44–45).

¹¹ Prefixes, such as *con-*, *re-*, *se-*, etc. are considered to be a type of preposition by Roman grammarians.

¹² These passages (298, 5–10B; 308, 3–8B) are attributed to Cominianus and Julius Romanus.

¹³ “Scaurus lists the prepositions taking the accusative case in the following manner...”

¹⁴ “The following prepositions take the accusative case”.

¹⁵ Both the *APS* and the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 562, 10) have “*ablatiui casus sunt hae*” at this point.

¹⁶ The corresponding passage in the *Explanationes* reads “... *adversus uls ad*” (GL 4: 562, 1–2).

¹⁷ The text of the *Explanationes* reads “... *contra cis citra*” (GL 4: 562, 2) and “... *contra ius, cis Galliam, citra sedem*” (GL 4: 562, 5–6). The *APS* reads “...*contra, <cis>, citra*” (XIV, 11–12) and “...*contra ius, cis Galliam, citra sedem*” (XIV, 15).

the door’) make more sense, but the same example also occurs in the *Explanationes*.¹⁸ Furthermore, without this correction there would be two examples for the preposition *penes*.¹⁹ Having made these corrections, it is necessary to add the preposition *penes* to the end of the list of the prepositions taking the accusative case (XIV, 13). This addition is corroborated by the fact that *penes* occurs at the end of the list also in the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 562, 4). Besides, the text of the *APS* (XIV, 18–19) contains the example *penes amicum* as the final example of the prepositions taking the accusative case.²⁰

The list of examples also contains two instances of the preposition *trans* (XIV, 16; 18). The second example, *trans montem*, is in its correct place among the examples, when we compare them with the list of prepositions (XIV, 11–13). However, the first of the two examples, *trans flumen*, is closer to the text of the *Explanationes*, which contains the example *trans fluvium* (GL 4: 562, 9). There seems to have been some sort of confusion in the transmission of this list; the word *montem* could have been copied in error by a copyist influenced by the example *iuxta montem*, occurring earlier in the text. Nevertheless, I have rejected the reading *trans flumen* from the edited text, as that example seems misplaced in the light of the preceding list of examples.

The list of the prepositions taking the ablative case also has a few textual problems. On line 19 the preposition *absque* has been added to the text, as there is a corresponding example (*absque pudore*) on the following line. That preposition and the corresponding example are not included in the text of the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 562, 10–13). The example illustrating the use of the preposition *abs* has also been lost (XIV, 20), but no attempt at a reconstruction can reliably be made, as the text of the *Explanationes* is of no help at this point.

Next, the author of the *APS* discusses prepositions common to both cases (XIV, 22–24). An identical discussion can also be found in the *Explanationes*.²¹ In his edition, Keil has deleted the word *rem* from the sentence beginning with “*cum in loco [rem] significare velimus...*” (GL 4: 562, 14). I have included his emendation also in the text of the *APS*.

The author of the *APS* then proceeds to discuss the preposition *super*. From this part onward, the text has no direct links to any surviving grammar. Two quotations from the *Aeneid* are included

¹⁸ The text of the *Explanationes* reads thus “... *usque pone supra*” (GL 4: 562, 2) and “... *usque Romam, pone fores, supra regem*” (GL 4: 562, 5).

¹⁹ XIV, 14 (*penes fores*) and XIV, 18–19 (*penes amicum*).

²⁰ This example is missing in the *Explanationes*, and Keil remarks on this in his apparatus: “*praeterea exemplum praepositionis penes omissum est*” (GL 4: 562).

²¹ The two texts are identical, except for the fact that two examples illustrating the use of the preposition *subter* are missing in the *Explanationes*: “*in autem et sub et subter utrique pariter casui serviunt, cum in loco [rem] significare velimus, ablativo; cum in locum accusativo, ut in foro sum et in forum eo, [ut] sub tecto sum et sub tectum fugio*” (GL 4: 562, 13–16). Cf. XIV, 22–24.

in this discussion to demonstrate the uses of the preposition *super* with the accusative and ablative cases. The *APS* is by no means the only grammar to address this issue.²² The first of the two quotations from Virgil, “*at Lausum socii exanimem super arma ferebant*”,²³ is only used one other time in the corpus of Late Latin grammars, albeit in a slightly shorter form. It occurs in Audax’s grammar, also in conjunction with a discussion on the use of the preposition *super* (*GL* 7: 355, 22).²⁴ The second quotation, demonstrating the use of *super* with the ablative case, “*multa super Priamo rogicans, super Hectore multa*”,²⁵ is much more widely used in Late Latin grammars; it appears, for instance, also in Donatus’ *Ars maior* and *Ars minor*, in the works of Charisius, Diomedes, and Dositheus, and in Priscian’s *Institutiones*.

Toward the end of the chapter on the preposition, the author of the *APS* discusses some attributes of the preposition *in*.²⁶ These last few sentences (*XIV*, 29–31) contain serious textual problems. The beginning of the sentence reads “*in praepositio quando locum alia parte orationis ponitur*”. I consider *locum* to be most likely a copyist’s error, added at some stage of the transmission due to contamination with the previous lines: lines 23 and 25 both contain the word *locum*. Also, I have emended *ponitur* to *praeponitur*, as *prae-* (abbreviated with *p̄*) could easily have been omitted from the text due to a haplography on the copyist’s part. Another possible emendation would be “*In praepositio quando [locum] <ante> aliam partem orationis ponitur*”, but the disappearance of *ante* would be, in my view, harder to explain.

The phrase *positivae uocis* (‘of the unaugmented word’) is rather rare. In the corpus of Latin grammars, the term *positivus* is mostly used in discussing the comparative forms of adjectives. Priscian, however, uses the term *positivus/positiva* for the basic form of a word, as opposed to a word formed by derivation or compounding, as in “*Sciendum tamen, quod inveniuntur quaedam positiva inchoativorum formam habentia ... , ut quiesco, pasco, compesco, disco, posco*” (*GL* 2: 429, 16–18).²⁷

The last part of the chapter concerns the pronunciation of the prepositions (or rather prefixes)

²² See, for instance, Charisius (303, 7–10B).

²³ *Aen.* 10.841: “But lo! his peers bore the dead Lausus back upon his shield” (translation by Williams 1910).

²⁴ The discussion in Audax’s *Excerpta* (*GL* 7: 355, 20–28) contains the same two literary examples as the account in the *APS*. However, the passage in Audax is longer, containing four additional literary quotations as well as a reference to Plinius Secundus; also the wording in the two passages is mostly different.

²⁵ *Aen.* 1.750: “Now many a tale of Priam would she crave, of Hector many” (translated by Williams 1910).

²⁶ The author of the text notes that the preposition (or prefix) *in* has two opposite meanings when it is prefixed to another part of speech. This obviously has to do with the fact that there are two homonymous prefixes in the Latin language, only one of which is connected with the preposition *in* and “combines, usually with verbs, in the local or transferred senses of the preposition” (*OLD*: s.v. *in-*¹). The other prefix *in-* denotes privation or negation.

²⁷ “It should be known that there are some basic forms of verbs that resemble inchoative verbs, ... such as *quiesco, pasco, compesco, disco, posco*.”

in- and *con-* when they are prefixed to other parts of speech.²⁸ The text of the manuscript is rather corrupt at this point,²⁹ but the meaning of the passage remains clear enough. This issue is discussed also by other Late Latin grammarians, although the wording of the comparable passages does not coincide with that of the discussion in the *APS*.³⁰ The author of the *APS* includes only one example to illustrate this matter, *infelix*.³¹ Although it is a suitable example for this phenomenon, it could have been included merely because of contamination with the preceding passage, which contains the examples *inmitis* and *infelix* (XIV, 31). An example illustrating the pronunciation of the preposition *con-* seems to be missing altogether, and, considering the confusion in the passage, it may well have been omitted at some stage of the transmission. However, such an example is not necessarily required here³² and might never have been included in the first place.

²⁸ What is at issue here is the lengthening of vowels before the consonant clusters *ns* and *nf* in Latin (See Leumann 1977: 112ff.). As the cluster *nf* only occurs in such cases as this (the prefixes *in-* or *con-* prefixed to a word beginning with *f*), the phenomenon was discussed in the chapter on the preposition by the ancient grammarians, although it affects the language more generally (e.g., *legens*). Already Cicero (*Orat.* 159) writes on the pronunciation of such words, and the matter is also discussed by Gellius (2.17.2ff.): “*Observe curioseque animadvertit M. Tullius “in” et “con” praepositiones verbis aut vocabulis praepositas tunc produci atque protendi, cum litterae sequerentur quae primae sunt in “sapiente” atque “felice,” in aliis autem omnibus correpte pronuntiari.*” I would like to thank Professor De Nonno for his comments on this issue and for pointing out these passages to me.

²⁹ XIV, 32–33: “*In et con syllabae [sequentes infelix syllabae] sequentibus <‘s’> uel <‘f’> litteris producuntur, <ut ‘infelix’, sequentibus> ceteris omnibus corripuntur.*”

³⁰ The matter is discussed by Donatus, for instance (648, 14–649, 1H): “*Ex quibus in et con praepositiones, si ita compositae fuerint, ut eas statim s uel f litterae consequantur, plerumque producuntur, ut insula, infula, consilium, confessio*”. Also Victorinus, whose account is somewhat closer in its wording, comments on the matter: “*in et con aliquando corripuntur, sequentibus s vel f litteris producuntur, instans infidus et reliqua*” (GL 6: 204, 15–16).

³¹ This example is also attested in Ps.-Probus’ discussion (GL 4: 149, 31–33): “*In et con praepositiones antecedentibus s uel f litteris producuntur, ut puta insolens insertus infelix inferens consonans consertus confusus; sic et cetera talia.*”

³² Compare the passage with Victorinus’ discussion (GL 6: 204, 15–16). See n. 30 above.

3.12 De coniunctione

The chapter on the conjunction is rather straightforward, containing the definition, a discussion on the three *accidentia* of the conjunction, and a short mention of the possibility of homonymy between conjunctions and adverbs.

The standard definition of the conjunction shows, perhaps, the least variation in the corpus of Late Latin grammarians.¹ Baratin (1989: 49–50) traces the origin of this definition to the grammar of Remmius Palaemon.² This attribution is based on the definition found in Diomedes' grammar (*GL* 1: 415, 16–17): "*Palaemon eam ita definit, coniunctio est pars orationis conectens ordinansque sententiam.*"³ However, Charisius (290, 12–14B) attributes to Palaemon a definition that is more in line with the defining practices of earlier Latin grammars: "*Palaemon autem ita definit. coniunctionum quaedam sunt principales, aliae subsequentes, aliae mediae, quibus utralibet parte positis sine vitio coniungitur oratio.*"⁴ This definition is not mentioned in Baratin's discussion, perhaps because he does not consider it a proper definition. The form of this definition does not coincide with the definitions that were used in Latin grammars from the third century onward, namely essential definitions.⁵ Palaemon does not seem to define parts of speech in the same way as the Late Latin grammarians,⁶ and it may not be possible to trace the origin of the standard definition of the conjunction to a specific Latin grammarian.

The standard definition of the conjunction was widely used from the late third to early fourth century AD onward. It appears in the works of grammarians belonging to that era, such as Sacerdos, Ps.-Probus, and Cominianus. Although he did not know all of the standard definitions in use at the

¹ The definition used in the *APS* is the following (XV, 3): "*Coniunctio est pars orationis conectens ordinansque sententiam.*" Instead of the verb *conectens*, also *adnectens* and *nectens* occur in some definitions, and Ps.-Asper uses the verb *copulans* (*GL* 5: 553, 10). In Sacerdos' grammar the noun *dictionem* replaces *sententiam* (*GL* 6: 444, 22). Diomedes and Priscian have definitions which diverge somewhat from the others: "*Coniunctio est pars orationis indeclinabilis copulans sermonem et coniungens vim et ordinem partium orationis*" (Diom. *GL* 1: 415, 13–14) and "*coniunctio est pars orationis indeclinabilis, coniunctiva aliarum partium orationis, quibus consignificat, vim vel ordinationem demonstrans*" (Prisc. *GL* 3: 93, 2–3). Additionally, some commentators of Donatus quote etymological definitions as well, but we will not discuss them further here.

² According to Baratin (1989: 50), Palaemon translated into Latin the definition used by the Alexandrian grammarian Tryphon.

³ "Palaemon defines it [the conjunction] in the following way: the conjunction is a part of speech which connects a complete meaning and creates order."

⁴ "Palaemon defines [the conjunction] in the following way: some conjunctions are preposed, some subjoined and some are either. In either position they connect the complete meaning correctly."

⁵ Sacerdos is the first to have definitions of this type, that is, essential definitions, (e.g., 'x is a part of speech...') in Latin grammars. See Luhtala (2002: 272) for a comparison of the essential definitions and the definitions used by earlier grammarians, e.g., Q. Terentius Scaurus and Remmius Palaemon.

⁶ See the discussion in Luhtala (2002: 272).

time,⁷ also Augustine includes this definition of the conjunction in his *Ars breuiata*.⁸ The only definitions that differ from the standard definition are the ones used by Priscian (who was probably using Apollonius Dyscolus as his source), Diomedes, and Palaemon (quoted by Charisius).

The definition used in the *APS*, “*Coniunctio est pars orationis conectens ordinansque sententiam*” (XV, 3),⁹ begins the chapter on the conjunction, and it is followed by a list of the *accidentia* of the conjunction (*potestas*, *figura*, and *ordo*). The author of the *APS* treats *potestas* (‘force’ or ‘meaning’) first. He divides the conjunction into five subcategories, namely *coniunctiones copulatiuae*, *disiunctiuae*, *expletiuae*, *causales*, and *rationales*. This is the most common division used in Late Latin grammars,¹⁰ but other kinds of divisions are also attested. For instance, Dositheus has six subcategories and Priscian (again inspired probably by his Greek sources) has a total of 17 subcategories of conjunctions.

Although the subcategories appearing in different discussions of the conjunction are often the same, the conjunctions included in each subcategory by different authors vary. The categories of copulative and disjunctive conjunctions are the most stable of the five, with often the same six examples appearing in all discussions.¹¹ However, in the three remaining subcategories – that is, *expletiuae*, *causales*, and *rationales* – it is hard find such stability. A conjunction may appear in different subcategories in different grammars.¹² For instance, Sacerdos lists *enimvero* as a rational conjunction (*GL* 6: 446, 7), and Cominianus (quoted by Charisius at 290, 10B) follows suit, whereas Cledonius states emphatically that *enimvero* is a causal conjunction (*GL* 5: 73, 34–74, 1).¹³ The elusive difference between causal and rational conjunctions is not touched upon in the *APS* or

⁷ Augustine did not know the standard definition of the noun, for instance. See Luhtala (2002: 276).

⁸ Augustine, *Ars breuiata* (VII §1W): “*Coniunctio est pars orationis adnectens ordinansque sententiam*.”

⁹ “The conjunction is a part of speech which connects a complete meaning and creates order.”

¹⁰ It is used, for example, by Donatus, Sacerdos, Ps.-Probus, Cominianus (quoted by Charisius), Victorinus, Augustine, and Audax. See Baratin (1989: 69ff.) for more details on the different divisions of conjunctions in use in Late Latin grammars.

¹¹ Copulative conjunctions usually include the following: *et*, *-que*, *at*, *atque*, *ac*, *ast* (e.g., the grammars of Sacerdos, Cominianus, Ps.-Probus, Donatus, and Audax). Some authors might only include a couple examples for the sake of brevity: for instance, the grammar of Augustine has only *et*, *-que*, and *ac*. The disjunctive conjunctions appearing most often are the following: *aut*, *-ue*, *uel*, *ne*, *nec*, *neque*. For instance, Cominianus, Donatus, Audax, and Ps.-Probus, who have this list.

¹² This is demonstrated by Baratin in his discussion (1989: 69), where *quamvis* is included in the subcategory of causal conjunctions by Ps.-Augustine, expletive conjunctions by Sacerdos and Donatus, and among rational conjunctions (*ratiocinativae*) by Diomedes. Many more interpretations for *quamvis* can additionally be found in grammars using a different kind of subdivision (*subiunctivae*, *inlativae*, or *adversativae*).

¹³ Cledonius (*GL* 5: 73, 34ff.): “*Enim etenim enimvero: istae tres coniunctiones, quae similes sunt, semper causales sunt*.”

most other Late Latin grammars, but it seems to trouble a number of grammarians, such as Cledonius and Pompey.¹⁴

The fivefold division seems somewhat imperfect, as many of the most common conjunctions, such as *ut* and *cum*, are not included in any of these categories.¹⁵ Such omissions may lead us to wonder as to the origin of this division. Baratin sees the confusion as a result of Roman grammarians adopting and modifying a system¹⁶ from the Greek tradition without understanding its underlying principles (1989: 70). As mentioned above, some Roman grammarians try other solutions instead of the fivefold division, but even Priscian with his 17 categories fails to describe Latin conjunctions in a completely satisfactory manner.¹⁷

Looking at the manuscript reading of the beginning of the section on *potestas*, we can find two surprising elements among copulative conjunctions, namely the conjunctions *quin* and *immo*. The rest (*et*, *at*, *atque*, *ast*, and *ac*) are included in almost every surviving treatment of this subcategory. The conjunction *-que* is usually also included in this category, but it seems to be missing here. What is more, it is not found in the text of the *Explanaciones*, which echoes that of the *APS*.¹⁸ One possible explanation for the odd appearance of the conjunction *quin* is to consider it a corruption for the conjunction *-que*, which normally belongs to the subcategory of copulative conjunctions. I have thus emended the conjunction *quin* to *-que*. The conjunction *immo* is included in the subcategory of copulative conjunctions also in the text of the *Explanaciones*. A few authors do have a fuller list of copulative conjunctions than the six aforementioned conjunctions (see n. 11 above); they sometimes add to their lists of copulative conjunctions examples that others include in the subcategory of expletive conjunctions.¹⁹ Still, no other author includes *immo* in his list of copulative conjunctions. Indeed, *immo* only appears as an example in the subcategory of

¹⁴ Cledonius offers us the following explanation: “*Difficilis discretio est inter causales et rationales, quae res magis ad philosophos pertinet et oratores. aliud enim sunt causales, aliud rationales: potest esse enim causa, quae rationem non habeat; ratio sine causa non potest esse. alia discretio: ubi utimur causalibus, non utimur rationalibus; ubi rationalibus utimur, possumus uti et causalibus*” (GL 5: 73, 27–32).

¹⁵ The conjunction *ut* is described by Diomedes as a causal conjunction in his discussion of the homonymy of the adverb and conjunction *ut* in the chapter *de adverbio* (GL I: 408, 23).

¹⁶ Also in the Greek grammatical tradition this system was ultimately based on the examination of the complex sentence by the Stoics (see Baratin’s discussion in 1989: 62–70), and therefore it was not aimed solely at describing language accurately.

¹⁷ See Baratin (1989: 70): “Priscien lui-même en offre un exemple caricatural: sa classification des conjonctions latines comporte une catégorie, celle des *abnegatiuae* (GL III, 100. 5–14), qui est spécifiquement consacrée à des conjonctions grecques (*an et ken*).”

¹⁸ Lines XV, 6–19 match the text in the *Explanaciones* (GL 4: 560, 19–561, 2) almost to the word. The author of the *Explanaciones* also reveals his source (Scaurus), when he presents the subcategories of the conjunction: “*expletivas Scaurus sic posuit...*”

¹⁹ See, for instance, the list in Dositheus’ grammar, “... *ac*, ...*-que*, ...*atque*, ...*porro*, ...*quidem*, ...*quoque*, ...*etiam*, ...*at sed*, ...*autem*, ...*vero*, ...*id porro*, ...*equidem*” [the Greek variants were left out of the quotation] (53, 4–6Bo), and in Charisius’ work (where he is quoting Palaemon), “*-que et porro quidem quoque atque etiam ac item autem vero*” (290, 26–28B).

conjunctions called the *coniunctiones comparativae* or *relativae ad aliquid* (Charisius, 291, 15–17B).²⁰ On these grounds, I hesitate to include *immo* in the subcategory of copulative conjunctions, even though the appearance of *immo* also in the text of the *Explanationes* would speak for its inclusion.

The subcategory of disjunctive conjunctions in the *APS* contains no surprises; the conjunctions listed on line 7, *aut*, *-ue*, *uel*, *ne*, *nec*, and *neque*, are attested in most Late Latin grammars.²¹ This category is followed by the subcategory of expletive conjunctions, which also contains six conjunctions, *quidem*, *equidem*, *quoque*, *autem*, *tamen*, and *porro*.²²

The subcategory of causal conjunctions contains the longest list of examples in any of the five subcategories in the *APS*. This means, unfortunately, that there is also more chance for confusion. The *Explanationes* (GL 4: 560, 22–26) includes the following examples of causal conjunctions: “*causales, si etsi etiamsi tam tametsi siquidem quando quandoquidem quin quinetiam sinetiam sive seu sin nam namque ni nisi nisisi enim etenim sed praeterea quamobrem praesertim quam quamvis proinde saltem videlicet item itemque ceterum alioquin propterea sane*.” Based on this list, we can see that the manuscript containing the *APS* is missing the conjunction *ni*, which is hardly surprising considering that it is immediately followed by *nisi* and *nisisi*. Also, instead of *item*, *itemque* the manuscript reading is *ita*, *itaque*. A conjecture which Keil offers in his apparatus for “...etiamsi tam tametsi siquidem...” (GL 4: 560, 22–23), that is, “*fortasse etiamsi sitamen tametsi*”, seems likely to be correct in consideration of the corresponding sequence in the *APS*, “...etiamsi, [sed], sitamen...”. Finally, the *Explanationes* has the conjunctions *quam* and *quamvis* among causal conjunctions, whereas the *APS* has *quamquam* and *quamvis* in its list of examples for that category. The conjunction *quamquam* seems to appear more often than *quam* in the discussions on the conjunction in Late Latin grammars. With three consequent instances of *quam*, it is very easy to see how one might have been omitted at some stage of the transmission of the *Explanationes*.

The subcategory of rational conjunctions contains some textual problems as well (XIV, 11–13). The text of the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 560, 26–28)²³ matches the text of the *APS* word for word, except for two conjunctions. Firstly, the list in the *Explanationes* only has the conjunction

²⁰ According to Baratin (1989: 89ff.), Charisius is quoting Palaemon in this instance: “...relativae ad aliquid, ut Plinius ait, sive comparativae hae, magis potius immo, in hunc modum, ‘hic eat, immo ille vel potius ille’.” Also Diomedes has the same list (GL 1: 416, 27–29).

²¹ The text of the *Explanationes* is missing the conjunction *ne*; this is probably due to a copyist’s error at some stage of the transmission of the *Explanationes* (or its source).

²² This is also the list included in the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 560, 21–22). Although hardly universal, this particular list appears also in Cominianus’ grammar (quoted by Charisius) (290, 5–6B) and Ps.-Probus’ work (GL 4: 143, 34–36).

²³ “Scaurus rationales sic posuit, ergo igitur ita itaque enimvero quia qua quapropter quippe quoniam quoniamquidem ideo idcirco scilicet quatenus.”

enimvero, while in the *APS* the text reads: “...*enim, enimvero*” (XV, 12). While it might be justified to omit *enim* from the *APS* based on the text of the *Explanations*, I prefer to include it. Consequently, the conjunction *enim* is included among both the rational and the causal conjunctions in the *APS*, but this might reflect the conflicting sources the author was using. As mentioned above (see n. 13), Cledonius considered *enim*, *etenim*, and *enimvero* to be causal conjunctions, while Cominianus lists them all as rational conjunctions (290, 9–10B). The second problem in the text concerns the sequence “... *quia qua quapropter*” in the *Explanations* (GL 4: 560, 27). Keil states in the apparatus that the manuscript reads “*qua qua propter*”, with a correcting hand adding “*quia qua qua*”. Keil suggests that the sequence could be emended to “*quia quare quapropter*”. The text of the *APS* reads merely “...*quia, quapropter*”, and, considering the reading of the manuscript of the *Explanations II*, this could be a better conjecture for the text of the *Explanations* as well.²⁴

The second property of the conjunction discussed by the author is composition (*figura*). The text of the *Explanations* differs slightly in its details from the text of the *APS*.²⁵ This might be due to omissions in the transmission of the text or editorial decisions on the part of the compiler of the commentary, for instance, as regards cutting down the number of examples. The deleted conjunction *si* (XV, 14) should be interpreted as a dittography, influenced by the word *simplices* that follows.

The short chapter on the third *accidens* of the conjunction, order (*ordo*), also contains a few problems. The text of the manuscript, as well as that of the *Explanations*, adds the conjunction *igitur* to the list of examples of the conjunctions that are only used at the beginning of the sentence.²⁶ Surviving Late Latin grammars use various examples to illustrate this phenomenon.²⁷ Those that include *igitur* in their list of examples use it to demonstrate the type of conjunction that can be used both at the beginning of a sentence and also later on, e.g., Donatus’ *Ars maior*²⁸ and the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (129, 6Ma). Thus I feel confident in omitting *igitur* from the list of examples for *coniunctiones praepositivae* and adding it to the list of those conjunctions that can be

²⁴ Also Donatus (647, 6H) and Sacerdos (GL 6: 446, 7), for instance, have *quia* and *quapropter* in their list of rational conjunctions.

²⁵ The text of the *Explanations* (GL 4: 560, 28–30) runs thus: “*figura est in coniunctionibus, qua apparet, utrum simplices sint coniunctiones an compositae: simplices, ut quoniam; compositae quoniamquidem quandoquidem.*” Compare this with XV, 14–15: “*Figura est qua apparet [si] simplicesne sint coniunctiones an compositae: simplices, <ut> quoniam, quidem, quando; compositae, ut quoniamquidem, equidem, quandoquidem.*”

²⁶ The text of the *Explanations* (GL 4: 560, 30–561, 1) reads: “*ordo est in coniunctionibus, quo apparet quae praeponi tantum possit, ut nam equidem igitur; quae subiungi tantum, ut enim que autem; quae praeponi et subiungi, ut et.*”

²⁷ Cominianus (quoted by Charisius) gives only *at* as an example for this phenomenon (289, 24B), whereas Ps.-Probus includes eight examples (*at, ac, ast, sive, seu, vel, sin, sin autem*) in his discussion (GL 4: 144, 24–25). E.g., Diomedes (GL 1: 415, 26) and the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (123, 13Ma) quote *nam* as an example of this phenomenon.

²⁸ 647, 9–10H: “*Ordo coniunctionum in hoc est, quia aut praepositivae sunt coniunctiones, ut at ast, aut subiunctivae, ut que autem, aut communes, ut et igitur.*”

used in both positions. The *APS* contains two examples for conjunctions that cannot begin a sentence, namely *enim* and *autem*. The same category in the *Explanationes* contains three examples, *enim*, *-que*, and *autem* (*GL* 4: 560, 32). Taking into account the possibility that a copyist could have interpreted the sequence “...*que autem quae*...”(XV, 17) as a kind of dittography and thus omitted the conjunction *-que* from the text, we could argue for the addition of *-que* into the text of the *APS*.

3.13 De interiectione

The short chapter on interjection in the *APS* can be divided into three parts: the definition of the interjection, examples of various interjections, and a discussion on using other parts of speech as interjections.

The definition of the interjection shows the most variation among the Roman grammarians.¹ This is probably due to the fact that the Greek grammarians provided no direct model for such a definition, as they did not consider the interjection to be a separate part of speech (Luhtala 2002: 279). The definition occurring in the *APS* is the following: “*Interiectio est pars orationis [animi motum] animi affectum significans.*”² Many definitions of the interjection contain the phrase *animi affectus* (or *mentis affectus*), and some have the variant *animi motus*, but here the author has seemingly included both in his definition. As the difference between the meaning of these two phrases is slight and the combination of the two is not attested in any other definition, we are most likely dealing with a gloss incorporated into the text proper at some stage of the transmission.³ Definitions closest to the one used in the *APS* can be found in the grammars of Charisius (who quotes Cominianus and Julius Romanus), Dositheus, Victorinus, and Ps.-Asper.⁴ As is the case with most of the definitions of the parts of speech,⁵ the author of the *APS* has not added an etymological definition or even included an etymological element in his definition, unlike several other grammarians.⁶

The definition is followed by a list of examples of various interjections and the emotions that underlie them. These lists vary greatly among Latin grammarians in their length and detail; some grammarians also preface the list of examples with a mention of the only property of the

¹ Among this large variety, it is the following that particularly stands out: “*Palaemon ita definit. interiectiones sunt quae nihil docibile habent, significant tamen adfectum animi.*” This is the definition attributed to Remmius Palaemon by Charisius (311, 10–11B), which clearly shows that the defining practices of early Roman grammar differed from those of the later tradition (cf. Luhtala 2002: 279).

² XVI, 3: “The interjection is a part of speech signifying the passion of the soul.”

³ See also the passage in the *Explanaciones* (GL 4: 562, 18–19), which only contains the phrase *animi adfectum*.

⁴ Charisius “*De interiectione, ut ait Cominianus. interiectio est pars orationis significans adfectum animi*” (311, 4–5B) and “*G. Iulius Romanus ita refert. interiectio est pars orationis motum animi significans*” (311, 14–15B), Dositheus “*Interiectio est pars orationis significans affectum animi*” (64, 2Bo), Victorinus “*Interiectio quid est? Pars orationis animi adfectum significans*” (GL 6: 204, 20), and Ps.-Asper “*interiectio est pars orationis affectum animi significans*” (GL 5: 554, 13).

⁵ With the exception of the definition of the participle (XII, 4), where an etymological definition occurs: “*Nam participium dictum <est>, quod partem nominis, partem uerbi capiat.*”

⁶ See Donatus, *Ars maior*: “*Interiectio est pars orationis interiecta aliis partibus orationis ad exprimendos animi adfectus*” (652, 5–6H), Diomedes “*...quae aliis partibus orationis interiaci et inseri solet*” (GL 1: 419, 3–4), and Ps.-Sergius: “*Cur interiectio dicta sit in primo libro notavimus, eo quod aliis partibus interiecta sit, animi adfectum significans*” (GL 4: 562, 18–19).

interjection, *significatio* ('meaning').⁷ The author of the *APS* makes no mention of any properties (*accidentia*) in the chapter on the interjection.⁸

The examples the author includes in his discussion are all attested also elsewhere. The interjection *ua* is described as an expression of joy and is well attested in other grammars, as is *heu* (an interjection of grief).⁹ *Euax* is usually described as an interjection of exultation or joy, not of praise as in the *APS*.¹⁰ *Papae* (and less often *babae*) is universally described as an interjection expressing admiration, and this applies also to the *APS*. *Heus* is described by the author of the *APS* as an interjection of exclamation.¹¹ However, it rarely occurs in the treatment of the interjection in other grammars and is more often found in discussions on the adverb. It is precisely in the discussions on the adverb that the difference between *heus* the adverb and *heus* the interjection is explained.¹² The interjection *attat* is often described as an interjection expressing fear, but other descriptions can also be found in Late Latin grammars.¹³ In the *APS* the author regards *attat* as an interjection used by someone who observes something ("*aut animadvertimus, ut attat*" XVI, 5). The same description occurs also in the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 562, 20–21) and the grammar of Victorinus (*GL* 6: 204, 23). In the *Explanationes* we can assume that the similarity is due to the fact that compiler used the *APS* as his source. However, as regards Victorinus' grammar, the case is not quite as simple; we cannot say for sure whether Victorinus used the *APS* directly as his source or, what is more likely, some of the same sources as the author of the *APS*.¹⁴ The final example appearing in this section is *bombax*, which only appears twice in discussions of the interjection in Late Latin grammars. Ps.-Asper describes it as an interjection used to or ridicule someone.¹⁵ The

⁷ See, for instance, the *Ars minor* of Donatus (602, 3–5H): "*interiectioni quid accidit? tantum significatio. significatio interiectionis in quo est? quia aut laetitiam significamus, ut euax, aut dolorem, ut heu, aut admirationem, ut papae, aut metum, ut attat, et si qua sunt similia.*"

⁸ See the discussion in chapter 3.9, p. 177 n. 17.

⁹ For the interjection *ua*, see, e.g., Victorinus (*GL* 6: 204, 21), Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 447, 3–4), and Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 146, 4). For the interjection *heu*, see, e.g., Donatus (602, 4H & 652, 6H), Sacerdos (*GL* 6: 447, 8) and Ps.-Probus (*GL* 4: 146, 4).

¹⁰ See, for instance, Victorinus (*GL* 6: 204, 21–22) "*...aut exultantis ut euax*" and Donatus (652, 6–7H) "*...aut laetantis, ut euax*." Words such as *gaudentis*, *laetantis*, or *exultantis* are used to describe *euax* in almost every instance of the interjection that I could find in the corpus of Latin grammarians. In addition to the *APS*, the only other exception can be found in the *Ars* of Ps.-Asper, where the interjection *euax* is described as "*aut refectiois, ut euax*" (*GL* 5: 554, 17).

¹¹ XVI, 5: "*aut exclamamus, ut heus...*".

¹² Most occurrences of the word *heus* in the corpus of Latin grammarians concern the adverb *heus*, which is usually described as an *aduerbium uocantis* or *uocandi*. Even if the reference is to the interjection *heus*, it appears more often in the chapter on the adverb, as in, e.g., Cledonius' work (*GL* 5: 67, 1–2): "*heus, si raptim proferimus, aduerbium est; si cum dolore, interiectio: sic et heu.*" See also Donatus (642, 8H) and Servius (*GL* 4: 440, 2).

¹³ *Attat* is described as an expression of fear in Diomedes' work (*GL* 1: 419, 7), Donatus' *Ars minor* (602, 5H), and Dositheus' grammar (64, 6–7Bo). Other descriptions include those of Ps.-Asper (*GL* 5: 554, 15) "*immutantis*" and Diomedes (*GL* 1: 419, 11) "*...aut ex inproviso aliquid deprehendentem, ut attat*", which is closer to the description in the *APS*.

¹⁴ See the discussion in chapter 1.4 in the introduction.

¹⁵ *GL* 5: 554, 17: "*aut irridentis, ut bombax babo ua.*"

mention in the *Explanationes* (GL 4: 562, 22) is identical in its wording to the *APS*, apart from the variant spelling, *bobax*. The interjection is explained as an interjection used to express our noticing something funny (“... *aut ridiculi animaduersionem exprimimus, ut bombax*”).

The compiler of the *Explanationes* includes a very similar list of examples in his discussion of the interjection. This is obviously due to Ps.-Sergius using the *APS* as his source. However, somewhere in the transmission of the second book of the *Explanationes* (or the version of the *APS* the compiler used) some of the examples preserved in the *APS* have been lost due to omission.¹⁶

The last part of this brief discussion on the interjection contains literary quotations in which other parts of speech are used as interjections. The class of interjections presented problems for the ancient grammarians, as it was hard to completely exclude other parts of speech from this class.¹⁷ The characteristics distinguishing interjections from adverbs, for instance, namely form, (the presence or absence of) *affectus*, and optionality,¹⁸ can seem somewhat forced in the discussions of Late Latin grammarians (Sluiter 1990: 213–219). The central element of the definition of the interjection appearing in the *APS*, among others, “*animi affectum ... significans*” (‘signifying the passion of the soul’), could be applied to other parts of speech as well as the interjection.¹⁹ Furthermore, the etymological explanation of the interjection used by some grammarians²⁰ (but not the author of the *APS*) is unable to distinguish the interjection from all other parts of speech. In rhetoric, for instance, the term *interiectio* is used to refer to any word or phrase inserted parenthetically into a sentence (Sluiter 1990: 176). These considerations, along with the fact that the Greeks managed without such a word class, could bring the status of the interjection as an independent part of speech into question at times. This can be seen, for example, in the definition

¹⁶ Cf. GL 4: 562, 19–21: “*vario autem adfectu movemur. nam aut laetamur, ut bach; aut dolemus, ut heu; aut animadvertimus, ut attat; aut ridiculi animaduersionem exprimimus, ut bobax*” with XVI, 3–6: “*Vario autem affectu mouemur: nam aut laetamur, ut ua, aut dolemus, ut heu, aut laudamus, ut euax, aut ammiramur, ut papae, aut exclamamus, ut heus, aut animaduertimus, ut attat, aut ridiculi animaduersionem exprimimus, ut bombax.*” The underlined part is missing from the *Explanationes*; the omission, due to a *saut du même au même*, is understandable, as the text between the very similar looking words *heu* and *heus* is the omitted part.

¹⁷ Cf. the view of Pompey on the matter (GL 5: 281, 10–19): “*plane illud scire debes, quod plerumque non solum integra pars orationis, sed elocutio omnis pro interiectione est. si dicas: pro hoc contigisse, nefas hoc contigisse, ecce pro et nefas interiectiones sunt. iunge utrumque, et unam interiectionem facit, pro nefas hoc contigisse: iam et pro et nefas tale est, ac si dicas: o hoc contigisse. iunge item aliqua plura, pro Iuppiter optime nefas hoc contigisse, omnis ista elocutio pro una interiectione est. nam interiectio est res quae exprimit animi motum. quidquid potest animi motum exprimere, sive in una re fuerit siue in multis, interiectio dicenda est.*”

¹⁸ See Sluiter (1990: 214): “I.e. the (lack of) syntactic and/or semantic coherence with verbs or the linguistic context in general (cf. Julius Romanus (Char.) 248, 7ff.; 249, 19ff.; Probus IV 146, 14).”

¹⁹ Cf. Diomedes (GL I: 419, 17–19): “*et fere quidquid motus animi orationi inseruerit, quo detracto textus integer reperitur, numero interiectionis accedet.*”

²⁰ Cf. Donatus’ *Ars maior* (652, 5–6H): “*interiectio est pars orationis interiecta aliis partibus orationis ad exprimendos animi adfectus*”. See also Cledonius (GL 5: 26, 13–14): “*interiectio dicta, quod interponitur ad exprimendos tantum animi affectus.*”

occurring in the *Regulae* of Ps.-Augustine (141, 10–11Ma): “*Interiectio non pars orationis est, sed affectio erumpentis animi in vocem ...*”.²¹

On lines 8–9 the author of the *APS* quotes two examples from Virgil in which other parts of speech are used as interjections.²² The same examples appear in the *Explanationes* and the grammar of Victorinus, both of which have ties with this work, but nowhere else in the corpus of Late Latin grammarians.²³ The edited text of the *APS*²⁴ has been supplemented on the basis on the text of the *Explanationes*, where the mention of Virgil logically precedes the quotations from his works. Obviously Virgil is often quoted without attributing the quotation to him, because everyone was assumed to know his work anyway. However, the mention of Plautus right before the Virgil quotations (XVI, 7) speaks for the addition of “*Nam et Vergilius sic posuit*” (‘Also Virgil wrote thus’) into the text. Otherwise the quotations from Virgil would be attributed to Plautus instead, something no self-respecting *grammaticus* would want to bring about.

²¹ “An interjection is not a part of speech, but the emotion of the soul bursting into sound ...”, (translated by Sluiter 1990: 191 n. 6). Also, the definition of the interjection appearing in Sacerdos’ grammar (*GL* 6: 447, 2–3), “*Interiectio est pars orationis adverbio persimilis, qua significantur animi variae passiones, quas quidam adfectus dicunt*”, suggests that the separation of the interjection and the adverb was not completely clear-cut.

²² The quotations in question are “*sequiturque, nefas, Aegyptia coniux*” (*Aen.* 8.688) and “*pecudesque locutae, infandum*” (*G.* 1.478–479). Also Plautus is mentioned in the text, but no examples from his work are quoted to illustrate the issue in question.

²³ *Aen.* 8.688 is, however, used also in Ps.-Probus’ *De ultimis syllabis* to demonstrate the length of the syllables forming the word *nefas*.

²⁴ XVI, 7–10: “*Apud Plautum sunt quaedam partes orationis pro interiectionibus positae. <Nam et Vergilius sic posuit,> ut ‘sequiturque, nefas, Aegyptia coniux’, - nefas hic enim interiectio est - et ‘pecudesque locutae, infandum’. Item ‘pro dolor’ et ‘pro pudor’ cum dicimus et siqua sunt similia.*”

4. Conclusions

The present volume contains the first edition of an anonymous Late Antique Latin elementary grammar discovered by Dr. Vivien Law more than two decades ago. It includes not only the edited text and a translation of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* (thus named because of the attributions of both Dr. Law and the compiler of the *Explanationes*) but also a commentary, which aims to help the reader recognize the connections this text shares with other extant grammars. In the introduction and the commentary an attempt has also been made to describe certain developments in the Roman language science that can be detected in the doctrine of the *APS*. In addition to some articles by Dr. Law, little else has been written on this grammar during these past few decades. Particularly noteworthy, of course, is the article that appeared in 1987¹ and first announced Law's significant discovery to the scholarly community.

P. L. Schmidt's concise contribution toward the study of the newly discovered *APS* appeared in vol. 5 of the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* in 1989. In his article we can find another view on this topic. Although doubtful of Law's attribution of the *APS*, he nevertheless argued that the work echoes the genuine doctrine of Q. Terentius Scaurus, if only in the form of an epitome (1989: 108). However, the fact that the content of the *APS* does not agree with what little has been preserved from the works of Q. Terentius Scaurus makes the hypotheses presented by Law and Schmidt questionable. Similarly, recent views as regards the development of ancient linguistics are in contradiction with the attribution of the *APS* to Scaurus; these views include the findings of Anneli Luhtala² concerning the interaction of grammar and philosophy in Late Antiquity. In the light of the recent findings on the defining practices of ancient grammarians, for instance, the material contained in the *APS* belongs to a period later than the second century AD. However, most of the doctrine ascribed to Q. Terentius Scaurus, such as his definitions of *nomen*, *appellatio*, and *uocabulum*, is in line with the relatively undeveloped metalanguage in the period studied by Fuhrmann (first century BC to second century AD) (1960: *passim*).

¹ V. Law (1987): "An Unnoticed Late Latin Grammar: The *Ars Minor* of Scaurus?" *RhM* 130, p. 67–89. Also concerning the *APS*: V. Law (1997) "Late Latin Grammars in the Early Middle Ages: A Typological History" *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages*, p. 54–69, V. Law (1990) "Roman Evidence on the Authenticity of the Grammar attributed to Dionysius Thrax", *History and Historiography of Linguistics I*, p. 89–96, and V. Law (1984) "St Augustine's «De grammatica»: Lost or Found?" *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19, p. 155–183.

² See, e.g., A. Luhtala (2005): *Grammar and Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, A. Luhtala (2002): "On Definitions in Ancient Grammar", *Orbis Supplementa 19 – Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, p. 257–285, and A. Luhtala: (2010): "Latin *Schulgrammatik* and the Emergence of Grammatical Commentaries", *Condensing texts - condensed texts*, p. 209–243.

An important adjustment in the paradigm of the study of ancient linguistics has taken place during the last couple of decades, with the repudiation of the traditional, static model of historiography in favour of one emphasizing the fact that grammatical science did not emerge fully formed in about 100 BC with the *Techne grammatike* of Dionysius Thrax. According to Daniel Taylor (1987: 11), grammar became independent of philosophy and the study of literature during the first century BC, but even this view is now considered too optimistic. Instead, it most likely took several centuries of interaction with philosophy before “grammar developed, by trial and error, the tools which became canonical in the works of Donatus” (Luhtala 2010: 238).

These recent views have helped in interpreting the doctrine presented in the *APS*, its structure, and other aspects that would have seemed rather puzzling in the framework of the traditional historiographical model of Latin grammar. If countless works similar to those of Donatus had been written over several preceding centuries, the incoherence and conflicting solutions to presenting certain phenomena in the *APS*³ would seem eccentric, to say the least. But if we view this as evidence of a process whereby the philosophical apparatus, ultimately due to Apollonius Dyscolus, was being integrated into Latin grammar, with varying success, the picture emerging from Late Antique Latin grammars becomes much more comprehensible. Thus, instead of continuing on a well-established tradition of *Schulgrammatik*, Donatus’ work actually represents “a culmination of a renovation of the grammatical method” (Luhtala 2010: 211), and the *APS* must be analyzed bearing this in mind.

The *APS* is a grammar of the so-called *Schulgrammatik* type; it presents the canonical eight parts of speech in a systematic manner, preceded by a discussion on the items smaller than the word (sound, letter, syllable, and so on). The *APS* is similar in its scope to Donatus’ *Ars maior*,⁴ and, like Donatus’ grammars, it mostly conforms to the hierarchical structure and logical organization presupposed of a representative of the *Schulgrammatik* genre, in contrast to many of the other works assigned to that genre, e.g., the grammars of Sacerdos, Charisius, or Diomedes. Furthermore, the *APS* is similar to the works of Donatus also in being less strictly associated with the study of literature. As Luhtala argues (2010: 215–220), both the grammar of Diomedes as well as the outline of grammar gleaned from the discussion in Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria* (1.4–8) deal with grammar in a much wider sense than Donatus does. Thus, despite the fact that the *APS* includes a definition of grammar resembling the one appearing in Quintilian’s *Institutio* (1.4.2), with a reference to both the exegetical (*intellectus poetarum*) and the technical part (*recte scribendi*

³For instance, the solution of presenting the frequentative verbs under the *accidens numerus* in the *APS* seems very odd, if clearer solutions had existed for centuries (e.g., in Dionysius Thrax’s *Techne*). See V. Law (1990: *passim*).

⁴The *APS*, however, lacks a section on stylistics.

loquendique ratio), it nevertheless concentrates almost exclusively on the technical part. By the same token, Donatus' grammars do not include a definition of grammar at all, and his *Ars minor* may be the earliest manual of a purely technical nature (Luhtala 2010: 215–216).

Regardless of these affinities between Donatus' works and the *APS*, the closest connections with reference to particular passages in the *APS* can be found in the grammars of the so-called Charisius group. However, the three grammars, Charisius' and Dositheus' *artes* and the *Ars Bobiensis*, most likely post-date the *APS*, and the roles of Cominianus or the "Gewährsmann" posited by Barwick are not clear; thus the exact source for the similarities cannot be identified at present. Furthermore, I do not consider the *APS* to be part of the Charisius group in the same way as the three aforementioned grammars, as the similarities between the *APS* and that group of grammars are not as strong as within the group itself.

However, I can rule out with rather more certainty the hypothesis that the *APS* would be identical to the so-called "Gewährsmann des Aud.-Max.Vict." (cf. Barwick 1922: 86ff.) – that is, the "Scaurus" referred to in the title of Audax's work, *De Scauri et Palladii libris excerpta per interrogationem et responsionem*. The similarities between the *APS*, Victorinus' grammar, and the *Excerpta* of Audax are most probably due to a shared source, rather than direct knowledge.

For the most part, whatever his exact sources may have been, the author of the *APS* has managed to create a coherent work. Nevertheless, there remains some vacillation in the terminology appearing in the *APS*, attesting to the use of different sources and the coexistence of older and more recent doctrine. For example, the present tense is referred to as *instans* as well as *praesens*, and both the terms *comparatio* and *conlatio* appear in the discussion on comparison. These inconsistencies are, however, relatively few, and as a rule the work presents a unified whole. Nowhere does the author of the *APS* introduce several views on one point of doctrine, as often occurs in the grammar of Charisius,⁵ for example, or treat the same issue several times over, like the *Anonymus Bobiensis*.⁶

The *APS* has only partially adopted the material related to the post-Apollonian renovation of grammar, and its author can sometimes be seen to be struggling with integrating it into his work. This could suggest that the *APS* pre-dates Donatus' works, which show full integration of the new material. The *APS* might therefore share an early fourth century dating with, e.g., the *Instituta artium* of Ps.-Probus. On the other hand, Charisius' grammar (c. 362 AD), Diomedes' grammar (c. 370–380 AD), and Augustine's *Ars breuiata* (386–387 AD) all post-date Donatus' works (c. 350

⁵ For instance, several different accounts of verbal voice (*genus*), covering four pages in the modern edition (210, 3–213, 28B), are included by Charisius in his grammar.

⁶ Comparison is discussed twice, first at 7, 4–8, 18D and then at 37, 19–39, 24D.

AD), but they still fail to include some or all of the new features. All these three grammars do, however, contain some other aspects that clearly point to a dating in the latter part of the fourth century. Charisius' and Diomedes' grammars describe noun inflection at least partly within the framework of the genitive-based declensions, which do not occur in most early to mid fourth century grammars, such as the *Instituta artium* or Donatus' grammars.⁷ The *Ars breuiata* of Augustine contains several Christian references, which are very rare in Late Latin grammars.⁸ None of these features occurs in the *APS*, and, accordingly, an early to mid fourth century dating for the text seems likely enough.

The use of the *APS* by Diomedes or compiler of the *Excerpta Andecavensia* cannot be proved beyond doubt (see chapter 1.4, p. 38ff.). However, the *APS* was certainly used by the Late Antique or early Medieval compiler of the *Explanationes*. According to Paolo De Paolis (2000: 174ff.), the two separate works that appear together in Keil's edition of the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4: 486–565) were written by two different authors. His theory thus posits two compilers using the *APS*, with the quotations in the preface to book 1 and those in book 2 belonging to two different periods (2000: 198, 218). I find it implausible, however, that a text with so limited a circulation as the *APS* would have been available to two authors as widely removed in time and place as De Paolis suggests them to have been. De Paolis argues that the author of book 2 knew book 1 and continued upon it (2000: 196). In my view, this second author could also have written the preface to the final, composite work now containing the commentaries to both the *Ars minor* and the *Ars maior*.

The *Ars Pseudo-Scauri* enjoyed a very different fate compared with Donatus' relatively similar grammars; the *APS* had hardly any influence on later grammatical works. In contrast to the *APS*, Donatus' works were studied in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, and they provided a model for grammatical works well into the early modern period, inspiring numerous commentaries,⁹ reworkings,¹⁰ glosses, and translations (Luhtala 2013: 356, 360, 366). Donatus' grammars were the most concise, orderly, and systematic of all extant Latin grammars, and, whereas other contemporary works were still struggling with the new material available, such as the essential definitions of the parts of speech, Donatus had integrated it systematically into his grammars. But, according to Luhtala, the environment in which Donatus was working must also have been a factor in his success: he was "close enough to influential Neoplatonic circles in Rome to enable his grammar to become the object of the first grammatical commentary by Servius" (2010: 238).

⁷ See the discussion on noun declension in chapter 3.6 (p. 140ff.).

⁸ See the discussion on p. 23–24 in chapter 1.3.

⁹ These commentaries span more than 1000 years, from the commentary of Servius (late 4th century) up to the end of the Middle Ages.

¹⁰ For example, the grammars of Peter of Pisa and Paul the Deacon in the 8th century.

The fate suffered by the *APS* was relatively common for a short *Schulgrammatik*-type grammar. According to Law (1997: 59), precisely the shorter texts of the *Schulgrammatik* genre seem to have been far less popular in the Early Middle Ages than the fuller versions; before the ninth century, there is no trace of the grammars of Ps.-Asper and Dositheus, for instance. During the seventh and eighth centuries these shorter grammars of the *Schulgrammatik* type were in direct competition with Donatus, mostly with poor results: several works of this type most likely vanished during this period (Law 1997: 59). These shorter works were briefly in vogue again in the ninth century, as is attested by many of the manuscripts which preserve them (Law 1997: 62, 66 n. 5). Ultimately, however, they failed to establish themselves in the curriculum, most likely because they were too similar to Donatus and seldom contained material that could not be found elsewhere (Law 1997: 62). Many of these texts had little influence on later grammars and “vanished from sight until the Renaissance” (Law 1997: 62). However, in the case of the *APS*, the disappearance would be of a longer duration.

With the present edition and commentary of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri*, the first step toward an understanding of this long-lost text has now been taken. The existence of an edition will hopefully spark interest in this text and elicit further research on a subject that is by no means exhausted.

5. Bibliography

- Atherton, Catherine & Blank, David (2013, forthcoming): "From Plato to Priscian: philosophy's legacy to grammar". *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Linguistics*, ed. by Allan, K. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (292–355).
- Ax, Wolfram (1986): *Laut, Stimme und Sprache, Studien zu drei Grundbegriffen der antiken Sprachtheorie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Baratin, Marc (1989): *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Baratin, Marc (1994): "Sur la structure des grammaires antiques". *Florilegium Historiographiae Linguisticae, études d'historiographie de la linguistique et de grammaire comparée à la mémoire de Maurice Leroy*, ed. by De Clercq, J. & Desmet, P. Leuven: Peeters. (143–157).
- Barwick, Karl (1922): *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars Grammatica*. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Barwick, Karl (1964)²: *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii artis grammaticae libri V*. Leipzig: Teubner. = B
- Biddau, Federico (2008): *Q. Terentii Scauri De orthographia. Collectanea grammatica Latina 5*. Hildesheim: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. = Bi
- Bierbrauer, Katharina (1990): *Die vorkarolingischen und karolingischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Bischoff, B. (1940): *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit. T. 1*. Leipzig.
- Bonaria, M. (1965): *I mimi romani*. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Bonnet, Guillaume (2000): "Charisius et Dosithée, reflets de Cominien". *Revue de philologie* 74/1, (7–16).
- Bonnet, Guillaume (2005): *Dosithée. Grammaire latine*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. = Bo
- Burton, Richard Francis (transl.) (1894): *Catullus: Carmina*. London.
- Carraro, Sandra (1999): "Osservazioni sulla definizione di pronome nelle *Artes grammaticae*". *Aevum* LXXIII/1, (81–91).
- Copeland, Rita & Sluiter, Ineke (2009): *Medieval Grammar & Rhetoric. Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300–1475*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CGL database = *Corpus grammaticorum Latinorum*. <http://htl2.linguist.jussieu.fr:8080/CGL/>.
- Dammer, Raphael (2001): *Diomedes grammaticus. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium Bd. 51*. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Della Casa, Adriana (1973): "La Grammatica". *Introduzione allo studio della cultura classica vol. II. Linguistica e filologia*. Milano: Marzorati. (41–91).

- Della Casa, Adriana (1985): "Rassegna di studi sui grammatici latini (1934–1984)". *Bollettino di studi latini* 15, (85–113)
- De Nonno, Mario (1982): *La Grammatica dell'Anonymus Bobiensis*. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura. = D
- De Nonno, Mario (1992): "Un esempio di dispersione della tradizione grammaticale latina: gli inediti *Excerpta Andecavensia*". *AION XIV*, (211–262). = DN
- De Nonno, Mario (1993): "Nuovi apporti alla tradizione indiretta di Sallustio, Lucilio, Pacuvio e Ennio". *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 121, (5–23).
- De Paolis, Paolo (1992): "L'edizione di testi tramandati in *excerpta*: una questione di metodo". *Les problèmes posés par l'édition critique des textes anciens et médiévaux*, ed. by Hamesse, J. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain. (57–71).
- De Paolis, Paolo (2000): "Le *Explanationes in Donatum* (GL IV 486–565) e il loro più antico testimone manoscritto". *Manuscripts and Tradition of Grammatical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance vol 1*, ed. by De Nonno, M., De Paolis, P. & Holtz, L. Cassino: Università degli studi di Cassino. (173–221).
- Di Benedetto, Vincenzo (1958): "Dionisio Trace e la *techne* a lui attribuita I". *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 27, (169–210).
- Di Benedetto, Vincenzo (1959): "Dionisio Trace e la *techne* a lui attribuita II". *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 28, (87–118).
- Di Benedetto, Vincenzo (1990): "At the Origins of Greek Grammar". *Glotta* 68, (19–39).
- Eder, Christine. E. (1972): *Die Schule des Klosters Tegernsee im früher Mittelalter im Spiegel der Tegernseer Handschriften, Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige* 83. München: Arbeo-Gesellschaft.
- Frede, Michael (1977): "The Origins of Traditional Grammar". *Historical and Philosophical Dimensions of Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, ed. by Butts, R. & Hintikka, J. Dordrecht: Reidel. (51–79).
- Frede, Michael (1978): "Principles of Stoic Grammar". *The Stoics*, ed. by Rist, J. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press. (7–75).
- Fuhrmann, M. (1960): *Das systematische Lehrbuch: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Funaioli, G. (1907): *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta. Vol. 1*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- GG = *Grammatici Graeci*. (ed. Uhlig). Leipzig: Teubner. 1883–1910.
- GL = *Grammatici Latini*. (ed. Keil). Leipzig: Teubner. 1857–1880.
- Glauche, Günter (2000): *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München: Die Pergamenthandschriften aus dem Domkapitel Freising: Bd. 1. Clm 6201–6316. (Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Monacensis; T. 3, Ser. nov. Ps. 2,1)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Goetz, G. & Schoell, F. (1910): *M. Terenti Varronis de lingua Latina quae supersunt*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Greenough, J. B. (transl.) (1900): *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics Of Vergil*. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Grondeux, Anne (2007): “Res Meaning a Thing Thought: The Influence of the *Ars donati*”. *Vivarium* 45, (189–202).
- Halm, Carolus et al. (1873): *Catalogus codicum Latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis I* 3. München.
- Holtz, Louis (1981): *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IVe–IXe siècle) et édition critique*. Paris: CRNS. = H
- Hovdhaugen, Even (1986): “*Genera verborum quot sunt?* – Observations on the Roman Grammatical Tradition”. *Historiographia Linguistica* 13:2–3, (307–321).
- Jeep, L. (1893): *Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen bei den lateinischen Grammatikern*. Leipzig.
- Jeudy, C. (1972): “L’*Institutio de nomine, pronomine et verbo* de Priscien: manuscrits et commentaires médiévaux”. *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 2, (73–144).
- Jeudy, C. (1974): “L’*Ars de nomine et verbo* de Phocas: manuscrits et commentaires médiévaux”. *Viator* 5, (61–156).
- Kaster, Robert (1988): *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kummrow, H. (1880): *Symbola critica ad grammaticos Latinos*. Greifswald.
- Law, Vivien (1982): *The Insular Latin Grammarians*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Law, Vivien (1984): “St Augustine’s «De grammatica»: Lost or Found?”. *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19, (155–183).
- Law, Vivien (1987): “An Unnoticed Late Latin Grammar: The *Ars Minor* of Scaurus?”. *RhM* 130, (67–89).
- Law, Vivien (1990): “Roman Evidence on the Authenticity of the Grammar attributed to Dionysius Thrax”. *History and Historiography of Linguistics I*, ed. by Niederehe, H-J. & Koerner, K. (=SiHoLS 51) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (89–96).
- Law, Vivien (1995): “The *Technē* and Grammar in the Roman World”. *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*, ed. by Law, V. & Sluiter, I. Münster: Nodus. (111–119).
- Law, Vivien (1996): “The Mnemonic Structure of Ancient Grammatical Doctrine”. *Orbis Supplementa 7 – Ancient Grammar: Content and Context*, ed. by Swiggers, P. & Wouters, A. Leuven: Peeters. (37–52).
- Law, Vivien (1997): “Late Latin Grammars in the Early Middle Ages: A Typological History”. *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages*. London: Longman. (54–69). [Originally printed in *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, ed. by Taylor, D. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.]

- Law, Vivien (2003): *The History of Linguistics in Europe from Plato to 1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leumann, M. (1977): *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1915): *Notae Latinae, An Account of Abbreviation in Latin MSS. of the Early Minuscle Period (c. 700–850)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luhtala, Anneli (2002): "On Definitions in Ancient Grammar". *Orbis Supplementa 19 – Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, ed. by Swiggers, P. & Wouters, A. Leuven: Peeters. (257–285).
- Luhtala, Anneli (2005): *Grammar and Philosophy in Late Antiquity* (= SiHoLS 107). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luhtala, Anneli (2010): "Latin *Schulgrammatik* and the Emergence of Grammatical Commentaries". *Condensing texts – condensed texts*. ed. by Horster, Marietta & Reitz, Christiane. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. (209–243).
- Luhtala, Anneli (2013, forthcoming): "Pedagogical grammars before the eighteenth century". *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Linguistics*, ed. by Allan, K. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (356–374).
- Mariotti, Italo (1967): *Marii Victorini ars grammatica. Introduzione, testo critico e commento*. Firenze: Felice Le Monnier. = M
- Mariotti, Italo (1976): "Note al testo dei grammatici latini". *Grammatici latini d'età imperiale*. Università di Genova: Istituto di filologia classica e medievale.
- Martorelli, Luca (2011): *Ps. Aurelii Augustini Regulae. Collectanea grammatica Latina 7*. Hildesheim: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. = Ma
- Matthews, Peter (1994): "Greek and Latin Linguistics". *History of Linguistics, II. Classical and Medieval Linguistics*, ed. by Lepschy, G. London & New York: Longman. (1–133).
- Mazzarino, A. (1955): *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta aetatis Caesariae*. Torino: Loescher.
- Merello, Margherita (1981): "Il termine 'littera' nella tradizione grammaticale". *Studi e Ricerche dell'Istituto di Latino IV*. Genova: Università degli studi di Genova. (101–107).
- Meyer, Paul Erich (1885): *Quaestiones grammaticae ad Scauri artem restituendam spectantes*. Jenae: Neuenhahn.
- Moussy, Claude (1999): "Les vocables latins servant à désigner le sens et la signification". *Conceptions latines du sens et de la signification*, ed. by Baratin, M. & Moussy, C. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne. (13–27).
- Munzi, Luigi (1992): "Il ruolo della prefazione nei testi grammaticali latini". *AION XIV*, (103–126).
- Mynors, R. A. B. (1969): *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1968–1982.
- Passalacqua, Marina (1978): *I codici di Prisciano*. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

- Passalacqua, Marina (1984): *Tre testi grammaticali Bobbiensi*. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura. = P
- Passalacqua, Marina (1999): *Prisciani Caesariensis opuscula II. Institutio de nomine et pronomine et verbo. Partitiones duodecim versuum Aeneidos principalium*. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura. = Pa
- Pinborg, Jan (1975): "Classical Antiquity: Greece". *Historiography of Linguistics*, ed. by Sebeok, T.A. (69–126).
- Reinikka, Anna (2008): "On the Attribution of a Latin School Grammar Transmitted in MS Clm 6281". *Arctos XLII*, (147–157).
- Robins, Robert Henry (1951): *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe with Particular Reference to Modern Linguistic Doctrine*. London: Bell.
- Robins, Robert Henry (1967): *A Short History of Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Rolfe, John C. (transl.) (1927): *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius. With An English Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Rosellini, Michela (2001): *Ps. Remmii Palaemonis Regulae. Collectanea grammatica Latina 1*. Hildesheim: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. = R
- Russell, Donald A. (2001): *Quintilian. The Orator's Education, Books 1-2*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Schad, Samantha (2007): *A Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology*. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra.
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M. (1990a): "Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics III – The Stoic ΤΕΧΝΗ ΠΕΡΙ ΦΩΝΗΣ". *Mnemosyne XLIII* 1–2, (87–108).
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M. (1990b): "Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics IV – Developments in the Study of Ancient Linguistics". *Mnemosyne XLIII* 3–4, (289–306).
- Schindel, Ulrich (1975): *Die lateinischen Figurenlehren des 5. bis 7. Jahrhunderts und Donats Vergilkommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schmidt, P. L. (1989): "Grammatik und Rhetorik". *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike, Bd. 5: Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.* München: Beck. (101–158).
- Schmidt, P. L. (1997): "Grammatik". *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike, Bd. 4: Die Literatur des Umbruchs von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur (117 bis 284 n. Chr.)*. München: Beck. (218–261).
- Sluiter, Ineke (1990): *Ancient Grammar in Context: Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- Speyer, W. (1971): *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*. München: Beck.
- Stangl, Thomas (1888): *Tulliana et Mario-Victoriniana*. München: J.B. Lindl.

- Steinthal, H. (1890–1891): *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Logik, I–II*. Berlin.
- Swiggers, Pierre & Wouters, Alfons (1995): “The Treatment of Relational Nouns in Ancient Grammar”. *Orbis Supplementa* 38, (149–178).
- Swiggers, Pierre & Wouters, Alfons (2002): “De Adverbio: Statut et significations de l’adverbe chez les grammairiens latins”. *Orbis Supplementa* 19 – *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, ed. by Swiggers, P. & Wouters, A. Leuven: Peeters.
- Taylor, Daniel J. (1987): “Rethinking the History of Language Science in Classical Antiquity”. *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, ed. by Taylor, D. (= SiHoLS 46). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (1–16).
- Taylor, Daniel J. (1991): “Latin Declensions and Conjugations: From Varro to Priscian”. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 13/2, (85–109).
- Tempesti, Anna Maria (1977): “Quinto Terenzio Scauro, grammatico adrianeo”. *Studi e Ricerche dell’Istituto di Latino I*. Genova: Università degli studi di Genova. (175–220).
- TLL* = *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. Leipzig, 1900–
- Tolkiehn, Johannes (1910): *Cominianus*. Leipzig: Dieterich’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Tolkiehn, Johannes (1913): *Dosithei ars grammatica*. Leipzig: Dieterich’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. = T
- Visser, Louise (2010): *The participle in Latin grammars in the Early Middle Ages*. Leuven: Faculteit Letteren.
- Watson, John Selby (transl.) (1899): *Conspiracy of Catiline*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers.
- Weber, Carolus (1861): *Ars sancti Augustini pro fratrum mediocritate breuiata*. Marburg: Elwert.
= W
- Wessner, P. (1923): “Servius”. Nr. 8. *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. II A* 2. Stuttgart. (1846–1847).
- Wessner, P. (1929): “Lucan, Statius und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern”. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 49, (296–303, 328–335).
- West, Martin L. (1973): *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.
- Williams, Theodore C. (transl.)(1910): *Aeneid*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Wouters, Alfons (1979): *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt: Contributions to the Study of the “Ars grammatica” in Antiquity. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, nr. 92*. Brussels.

APPENDIX – A Translation of the *Ars Pseudo-Scauri*¹

I Art (*De arte*)

Art is the knowledge of each subject acquired by practice or tradition. Its name is derived from the word *ἀρετή*;² hence the ancient writers called virtue art.

Above all, the art of grammar consists in the interpretation of the poets and the knowledge of correct speech and writing. The term *grammatica*³ is derived from *γραμματά*.⁴ Similarly, the Romans created the term *litteratura*⁵ which is based on the word *litterae*,⁶ and they called a grammarian a *litterator*.⁷

II Sound (*De uoce*)

Sound is air that is struck which is perceptible to the ear and the pronouncing of an idea expressed with words. Sound is either articulate or inarticulate. Inarticulate sound can be heard but not understood, for instance, the crying of an infant, the neighing of a horse, or the lowing of an ox. Articulate sound can be heard, understood, and explained; letters are based on this kind of sound.

Sound should precede letters, because it is not the letter that forms the basis of the sound, but rather sound that is the foundation of the letters. Sound remains inherent to people even without the existence of letters. Therefore, letters rest upon sound, and syllables consist of letters. Both short and lengthy words are composed of syllables, and these words, in turn, make up a complex sentence.

III Letters (*De litteris*)⁸

The letter is the smallest particle of articulate sound. A particle is the origin of each thing, from which it can be increased and into which it can be separated. Each letter has the following properties: a name, a force, and a form. The name of the letter is that by which it is called; the force reveals the sound value of a letter, and the form is used when writing it down.

Some letters are vowels; others are consonants. Vowels can be pronounced alone and form a

¹ I have not sought to modernize the content of the *APS* in this translation. Sometimes this approach will produce odd results (from a modern point of view). For instance, adjectives were not considered to be an independent word class by Late Latin grammarians; nouns (*nomina*) will therefore undergo comparison. Also, consonants were divided into two types by ancient grammarians, namely semivowels (*semiuocales*) and mutes (*mutae*) (roughly corresponding to modern continuants and stops). Obviously, today the term semivowel has a very different meaning.

² Gr. virtue

³ grammar

⁴ Gr. letters

⁵ the study of language

⁶ letters

⁷ a teacher (cf. the discussion on *litterator* in chapter 3.1)

⁸ The Latin term *littera* can refer both to a speech sound and its graphic sign, a letter. Some Late Latin grammarians use the terms *elementum* (speech sound) and *littera* (letter) to distinguish between the two. In the *APS*, however only the term *littera* is used. In accordance with the Latin usage, *littera* is consistently translated as ‘letter’ in this translation.

syllable by themselves. There are five of these: *a, e, i, o, u*. Two of these, *i* and *u*, sometimes have the sound value of consonants, for example, when two such vowels are joined together or combined with other vowels, as in *Iuno* or *uates*.¹

There are two subcategories of consonants, namely semivowels and mutes. Semivowels can be pronounced by themselves, but they cannot form a syllable alone. There are seven semivowels in all: *f, l, m, n, r, s, x*. One of these, *x*, is a double letter, because it consists of either the letters *g* and *s* or *c* and *s*, as in *rex, regis*² and *pix, picis*.³ Consequently, not all grammarians consider it to be a letter. Mute letters cannot be pronounced by themselves, nor can they form a syllable alone. There are nine of them in total: *b, c, d, g, h, k, p, q, t*. Some people think that the letters *k* and *q* are redundant, because the letter *c* could replace them. We regard the letter *h* as a sign of aspiration, not a proper letter. Besides, we include *y* and *z* among the letters because of names of Greek origin.

Latin nouns can end in only thirteen of these letters: *a, e, i, o, u, c, l, m, n, r, s, t, x*, as in *tabula*,⁴ *monile*,⁵ *frugi*,⁶ *ratio*,⁷ *genu*,⁸ *altec*,⁹ *mel*,¹⁰ *scamnum*,¹¹ *flumen*,¹² *arbor*,¹³ *flos*,¹⁴ *caput*,¹⁵ *caput*,¹⁵ *nox*.¹⁶

In other respects, concerning the various relationships between letters, it is more than satisfactory to keep to the precepts of Varro.

IV Syllables (*De syllabis*)

A syllable is either a vowel or a combination of letters bound into a single unit. A syllable is composed of one letter, such as *a* or *o*, or of several letters, such as *ae* or *te*. In a short syllable there is one beat, whereas in a long one there are two.

Monosyllabic words have an acute accent, if the syllable is short or considered long only by virtue of its position, as in *mel, fel, ars*, and *nox*,¹⁷ for instance. On the other hand, if the syllable is long by nature, it is pronounced with a circumflex accent, as in *sol, res*, and *spes*.¹⁸ In disyllabic words, however, <***>. In words of three or four or more syllables the penultimate syllable has a circumflex accent, if it is long by nature, as in the words *Othonis, Neronis*, and *Catonis*.¹⁹ On the

¹ Juno, seer.

² a king, nom. + gen.

³ pitch, nom. + gen.

⁴ a writing-tablet

⁵ a necklace

⁶ worthy

⁷ a reckoning

⁸ a knee

⁹ fish-sauce

¹⁰ honey

¹¹ a bench

¹² a river

¹³ a tree

¹⁴ a flower

¹⁵ a head

¹⁶ a night

¹⁷ honey, bile, art, a night

¹⁸ the sun, a thing, hope.

¹⁹ Otho (gen.), Nero (gen.), Cato (gen.)

other hand, if the penultimate syllable is long by virtue of its position, it is given an acute accent, as in *Metellus*, *Catullus*, and *gemellus*.¹ However, if the penultimate syllable is short, the preceding syllable must take the acute accent, as in *Valgius*, *Messius*, and *Sergius*. This rule does not apply to some syllables occurring in adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, or interjections.

Some syllables are long; others are short. Short syllables consist of short vowels, such as *ă* or *ĕ*, for instance, or they contain a short vowel preceded by a semivowel or mute, such as *tă* or *ră*. Long syllables are either long by nature or become so owing to their position. Syllables are considered long by nature, if they consist of a long vowel, such as *ō*, or several vowels forming a long syllable, such as *ae*, *tae*, or *uae*. There are eight ways in which syllables become long as a result of their position. This takes place, firstly, when a short syllable ends in a consonant and another consonant follows. Secondly, it occurs when a short syllable ends in two consonants, for example in the words *ast* or *est*,² as in ‘*ast ego, quae diuum incedo regina*’,³ or ‘*est in secessu longo longo locus*’.⁴ Thirdly, it happens when a short syllable is followed by two consonants, as in ‘*Acrisioneis Danae fundasse colonis*’⁵ and ‘*Atrides Protei Menelaus ad usque columnas exsulat*’.⁶ Fourthly, it takes place when a short syllable ends in a double letter (because we have one double letter, x), as in ‘*ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referri*’.⁷ The fifth type occurs when a short syllable is followed by a double letter, as in ‘*exsulibusne datur ducenda Lavinia Teucris*’.⁸ The sixth type has a short syllable followed by a vowel acting as a consonant, namely *u* or *i*, as in ‘*at Venus obscuro gradientis aere saepsit*’⁹ and ‘*at Iuno ex summo, qui nunc Albanus habetur*’.¹⁰ The seventh type has a short vowel followed by the letter *i*, as in ‘*Troiaque nunc staret*’.¹¹ In the eighth type a short vowel, occurring alone or with a consonant, forms a syllable in which the word ends, as in ‘*hoc erat, alma parens*’.¹²

All syllables are pronounced with an acute, grave, or circumflex accent. However, this must be done in such a manner that no part of speech contains too many circumflex or acute syllables at the same time.

V The Word (*De dictione*)

The word is an utterance that contains the form of signifying sound.

VI The Word (*De locutione*)

The word is an utterance of connected letters and syllables which has a single meaning

¹ a twin.

² but, (there) is

³ *Aen.* 1.46: “But I, who move among the gods a queen” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁴ *Aen.* 1.159: “A haven there walled in by bold sides” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁵ *Aen.* 7.410: “Built ... by the beauteous Danae and her Acrisian people” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁶ *Aen.* 11.262-263: “Atrides unto farthest Egypt strayed” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁷ *Aen.* 2.169: “Henceforth, I say, the (courage of the Greeks) ebbed utterly away” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁸ *Aen.* 7.359: “Can we give Lavinia’s hand to Trojan fugitives?” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁹ *Aen.* 1.411: “Venus then o’erweiled them as they moved in darkened air.” (translated by Williams 1910).

¹⁰ *Aen.* 12.134: “But Juno, peering from that summit proud, which is to-day Alban” (translated by Williams 1910).

¹¹ *Aen.* 2.56: “And Troy were standing on the earth this day!” (translated by Williams 1910).

¹² *Aen.* 2.664: “Was it for this, O heavenly mother mine” (translated by Williams 1910).

VII The Definition (*De definitione*)

The definition is a sentence that clearly describes, explains and defines that which is being examined.

VIII The Sentence (*De oratione*)

The sentence is a meaning composed of signifying words arranged according to reason, for instance, ‘*omnis homines, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus summa ope niti decet ne uitam silentio transeant ueluti pecora*’.¹

IX The Noun (*De nomine*)²

The noun is a part of speech signifying a corporeal or an incorporeal thing as a proper name or as a common name: as a proper name, e.g., *Roma* or *Tiberis*,³ as a common name, e.g., *urbs* or *flumen*.⁴ The noun has six properties: quality, comparison, gender, number, composition, and case.

The quality of nouns is twofold. Nouns are either proper nouns or common nouns. Proper nouns are those which contain the distinctive qualities of the names of gods, people, mountains, cities, or rivers: gods, like *Iuppiter* or *Apollo*,⁵ people, like *Cato* or *Cicero*, mountains, like *Cynthus* or *Olympus*, cities, like *Roma* or *Carthago*,⁶ rivers, like *Nilus* or *Eridanus*,⁷ as well as other nouns of this type. The proper names of people are divided into four subtypes: *praenomen*, *nomen*, *cognomen*, and *agnomen*,⁸ as in *Puplius Cornelius Scipio Africanus*. Some names appear alone, such as *Roma*, *Appenninus*, *Mars*, and *Ceres*.⁹ Some appear in twos, such as *Iuno Lucina*, *Liber pater*, and *Venus Verticordia*.¹⁰

Common nouns are divided into two subtypes, one of which signifies corporeal things, such as *homo*, *terra*, or *mare*,¹¹ and the other one incorporeal things, such as *pietas*, *iustitia*, or *dignitas*.¹² Common nouns have four subcategories; common nouns may signify a thing, a number, nationality, or order. Nouns like *homo* and *paries*¹³ signify a thing; nouns like *unus* and *duo*¹⁴ signify a number; nouns like *primus* and *secundus*¹⁵ signify order, and nouns like *Graecus* and *Hispanus*¹⁶ signify

¹ Sallust, *Cat.* 1.1: “It becomes all men, who desire to excel other animals, to strive, to the utmost of their power, not to pass through life in obscurity, like the beasts in the field” (translated by Watson 1899).

² See p. i n. 1, for the translation of *nomen*.

³ Rome, Tiber

⁴ a city, a river

⁵ Jupiter, Apollo

⁶ Rome, Carthage

⁷ the river Nile, the river Po

⁸ given name, family name, surname, nick-name

⁹ Rome, the Apennines, Mars, Ceres

¹⁰ lightbringing Juno (the goddess of childbirth), god of wine, Venus the turner of hearts

¹¹ a man, earth, sea

¹² piety, justice, dignity

¹³ a man, a wall

¹⁴ one, two

¹⁵ first, second

¹⁶ Greek, Spanish

nationality. None of the aforementioned nouns admit comparison; for instance, *Graecus* cannot become *Graecior*¹ or *Hispanus Hispanior*.² The same applies to other similar nouns.

There are nouns which the Greeks call τῶν πρὸς τί; these are nouns that are relative to something, such as *pater*, *mater*, or *frater*, and they cannot be understood on their own.³ They must be coupled with words that render them understandable, such as *meus*, *tuus*, *noster*, or *uester*.⁴ Similar to these nouns are those which the Greeks call τῶν πρὸς τί πως ἔχοντα, that is, expressing a relative quality, as in *dexterior* and *sinisterior*.⁵ Some nouns have an unspecified meaning. These nouns, like *magnus* and *fortis*,⁶ take their meaning from other nouns with which they are joined; they have no exact meaning of their own. For this reason some grammarians call them adjectives, for instance *magnus uir*⁷ and *fortis exercitus*.⁸

The nouns that signify a quality, like *pulcher* or *decens*,⁹ or a quantity, like *magnus* or *altus*,¹⁰ undergo comparison. But this does not apply to every noun which signifies a quantity or a quality. [...] Nouns like *mediocris*, *fatuus*, or *mortuus*,¹¹ among others, signify a quality, but only have a single degree of comparison.

There are three degrees of comparison, the positive degree, like *fortis*, the comparative degree, like *fortior*, and the superlative degree, like *fortissimus*.¹² However, not all nouns have all three degrees of comparison. Some nouns only have the positive degree, like *mediocris*, *fatuus*, and *mortuus*;¹³ some nouns have the positive and comparative degrees, like *iuuenis iuuenior* or *senex senior*.¹⁴ Some nouns have the positive and superlative degrees, like *fidus fidissimus* or *pius piissimus*¹⁵ (we form the missing comparative degree with the help of the adverb *magis*, as in *magis pius*).¹⁶ Some nouns have the comparative and superlative degrees, like *posterior postremus* or *exterior extremus*,¹⁷ whereas some only have the superlative degree, like *summus* or *nouissimus*.¹⁸ While some nouns have all three degrees of comparison, their form changes, as in *bonus melior optimus*¹⁹ or *malus peior pessimus*.²⁰ There are many nouns that admit only one degree of comparison; however, they may undergo comparison if we add the adverbs *magis* and *maxime*, as in *magis sobrius* and *maxime sobrius*.²¹ We add the adverbs *minus* and *minime* to form the degrees of comparison having the opposite meaning, as in *minus sobrius* and *minime sobrius*.

¹ more Greek

² more Spanish

³ a father, a mother, a brother

⁴ my, your, our, your (pl.)

⁵ more to the right, more to the left

⁶ great, strong

⁷ a great man

⁸ a strong army

⁹ beautiful, decent

¹⁰ great, high

¹¹ mediocre, foolish, dead

¹² strong, stronger, strongest

¹³ mediocre, foolish, dead

¹⁴ young & younger, old & older

¹⁵ trustworthy & most trustworthy, pious & most pious

¹⁶ more pious

¹⁷ latter & last, outer & outermost

¹⁸ highest, last

¹⁹ good, better, best

²⁰ bad, worse, worst

²¹ more moderate, most moderate

There are many nouns which do not have the positive degree and are derived from adverbs instead, like *ulterior ultimus*¹ from the adverb *ultra*,² *inferior infimus*³ from the adverb *infra*,⁴ *prior primus*⁵ from the adverb *prius*,⁶ *superior supremus*⁷ from the adverb *supra*,⁸ and *peior pessimus*⁹ from the adverb *peius*.¹⁰

The comparative degree is joined to the ablative case of a noun both in the singular and the plural number, as in *illo fortior* and *illis fortior*.¹¹ The superlative, on the other hand, is joined to the genitive in the plural number only, as in *fortissimus illorum*.¹² Some grammarians think that the comparative should be joined to the plural number only, but this is incorrect. The comparative is joined to the ablative case in both the singular and the plural number, whereas the superlative is joined to the genitive in the plural number only, when we carefully observe the rules of speaking; the superlative is joined to the plural form of a word referring to one's own countrymen, as in *fortissimus Romanorum Scipio*¹³ and *doctissimus Romanorum Cato*.¹⁴, whereas the comparative is joined to the plural form of a word referring to a different and foreign race, as in *fortior Poenis Scipio*¹⁵ and *doctior Gallis Cato*.¹⁶

There are many nouns that are comparative in their form but diminutive in their meaning, such as *infirmior* or *crudior*.¹⁷ These comparative forms do not increase the meaning of the positive form; instead they lessen it. *Infirmior* can mean somewhat less weak or almost weak, and *crudior* does not mean more crude but almost crude. We can see this type of usage in Virgil: '*tristior et lac(rimis) o(culos) s(uffusa)*'.¹⁸

Participles do not undergo comparison, and therefore most participles become nouns, when they are compared, for instance [...]

Also, some nouns signify genera, for instance, *animal* or *corpus*,¹⁹ while others signify species, e.g., *homo* or *lapis*.²⁰ Some nouns are primary, such as *mons* or *capra*;²¹ some are diminutive, *κατα ὑποκορισμὸν*, such as *monticulus* or *capella*;²² others are derivative, such as

¹ farther, farthest

² beyond

³ lower, lowest

⁴ below

⁵ former, first

⁶ beforehand

⁷ higher, highest

⁸ above

⁹ worse, worst

¹⁰ worse

¹¹ stronger than him, stronger than them

¹² the strongest of them

¹³ Scipio, the bravest of the Romans

¹⁴ Cato, the most learned of the Romans

¹⁵ Scipio, stronger than the Carthaginians

¹⁶ Cato, more learned than the Gauls

¹⁷ weaker, more crude

¹⁸ *Aen.* 1.228: "Her radiant eyes all dim with tears, nor smiling any more" (translated by Williams 1910).

¹⁹ an animal, a body

²⁰ a man, a stone

²¹ a mountain, a she-goat

²² a little mountain, a little goat

montanus or *caprarius*,¹ *monticularius* or *capellarius*.²

Gender is the source of generation. There are three genders, which are the masculine, the feminine and the neuter gender. Nouns of the masculine gender are preceded in the nominative singular by the pronoun *hic*, as in *hic miles*.³ Those of the feminine gender are preceded by the pronoun *haec*, as in *haec mulier*.⁴ Those of the neuter gender are preceded by the pronoun *hoc*, as in *hoc negotium*.⁵ The common gender can be formed in two ways. There are nouns that are common to the masculine and the feminine gender, such as *hic canis* and *haec canis*,⁶ or nouns that are common to the feminine singular and the neuter plural, such as *haec magna* (because we can say *haec magna mulier* and *haec magna mancipia*),⁷ or nouns common to all three genders, such as *hic felix*, *haec felix*, and *hoc felix*.⁸ There are also epicene nouns which the Greek call *ἐπίκοινα*, such as *passer* or *aquila*.⁹ These nouns refer to two genders while only having a single form, because we can equally take *passer* to mean a female sparrow and *aquila* a male eagle, although only a feminine noun is used.

The noun has two numbers, the singular and the plural number, the singular, as in *hic uir*, and the plural, as in *hi uiri*.¹⁰ There are noun forms that are common to both numbers, such as *res*, *nubes*, or *dies*.¹¹ There exist nouns that have only a singular form, such as *aurum*, *plumbum*, *oleum*, *garum*, *triticum*, and *uinum*.¹² There are nouns that only have a plural form, such as *sordes*, *moenia*, *cancelli*, *loculi*, *scalae*, *quadrigae*,¹³ *scopae*, *arma*, *castra*, *exta*, and *sabbata*.¹⁴ There are nouns with a singular form but a plural meaning, such as *populus*, *contio*, and *plebs*.¹⁵ There are some nouns which are plural in form but refer to a single entity, such as *Mycenae*, *Cumae*, and *Thebae*.¹⁶ There are nouns which cannot accurately be assigned to either the singular or the plural number and which should therefore be assigned to the dual number, such as *duo*, *ambo*, *uterque*, and *neuter*.¹⁷

The composition of nouns is twofold; nouns are either simple, like *felix*, or compound, like *infelix*.¹⁸ Compound nouns are formed in four ways: from two full forms, like *suburbanus*,¹⁹ or from two corrupt²⁰ forms, like *opifex* or *artifex*,¹ or from a corrupt form and a full one, like *ineptus*

¹ of a mountain, a goat-herd

² of a little mountain, of a little goat

³ this soldier

⁴ this woman

⁵ this occupation

⁶ this dog (m.), this dog (f.)

⁷ this great woman, these great servants

⁸ this happy (m.), this happy (f.), this happy (n.)

⁹ a sparrow, an eagle

¹⁰ this man, these men

¹¹ a thing/ things, a cloud/ clouds, a day/ days

¹² gold, lead, oil, fish-sauce, wheat, wine

¹³ mourning, walls, an enclosure, a coffer, stairs, a four-horse team

¹⁴ a broom, arms, an encampment, entrails, the Sabbath

¹⁵ a people, an assembly, the plebeian class

¹⁶ Mycenae, Cumae, Thebes

¹⁷ two, both, either, neither

¹⁸ happy, unhappy

¹⁹ suburban

²⁰ A corrupt form (*pars orationis corrupta*) could be described in more modern terminology as a bound form, as it cannot occur alone. A full form (*pars orationis integra*) is a word that can occur on its own, for instance *urbanus*. Note that also *sub* (which would nowadays be considered a prefix) was also considered a full form (a preposition) by the Late Latin grammarians.

or *insulsus*,² or from a full form and a corrupt one, like *omnipotens*.³ Sometimes we can find nouns that are composed of even more parts, like *inexpugnabilis* or *inperterritus*.⁴

Besides, there are nouns which the Greeks and Romans call patronymic, like *Atrides* or *Pelides*.⁵ These can be derived from the father, grandfather, or ancestor in Homer and also from the wife in the writings of Lycophron. In addition, there are others that can be understood naturally, such as ‘*ad Scipiadas duos bello*’,⁶ that is, members of the Scipio family. There is also a *dionymon*, a double name, such as *Paris Alexander* or *Elissa Dido*, or a homonym, which signifies several things with a single form, such as *nepos* or *acies*,⁷ or a synonym which refers to several nouns signifying the same thing, such as *terra humus solum*⁸ and *ensis mucro gladius*,⁹ or a *feronymon*, such as *Pasiphae* or *Hippolytus*, that is, a name derived from the brightness of the sun or the pulling asunder by horses, or eponym, as in ‘*Dardanio Anchisae*’.¹⁰

Nouns have six cases: the nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, and ablative case. However, each case rarely has a unique form. There are some nouns which have just one form for all six cases, such as *frugi*, *nequam*, *nihili*, and *nugas*,¹¹ for we say *hic nequam*, *huius nequam*, *huic nequam*, *hunc nequam*, *o nequam*, and *ab hoc nequam*, and similarly in the plural. There are also nouns which are used only in one case, like *sponte*, *tabo*, and *natu*,¹² only the ablative case form of these nouns is in general use. There are other nouns with three cases in general use, namely the nominative, accusative and vocative case, as in *fas* or *nefas*,¹³ as well as in some plural forms, like *maria*, *uina*, *rura*, *aera*, and *mella*.¹⁴ Also, the numerals from the number four to one hundred do not inflect for case. Other numerals can be inflected according to case and gender.

There are four subcategories of inflection for those nouns which are inflected together in twos. The first subcategory contains nouns with an uninflected first part, such as *Hellespontus*, *senatus consultum*, or *plebis scitum*.¹⁵ The second subcategory contains nouns with an inflecting first part and an uninflected second part, such as *tribunus plebis* or *praefectus equitum*.¹⁶ The third subcategory contains nouns with two inflecting parts, as in *Liber pater*, *Longa Alba*, and *Falernum uinum*.¹⁷ The fourth subcategory contains nouns with an inflecting first part and with a second part inflected for number but not for case, as in *pater familias* and *mater familias*.¹⁸ We say “*huius patris familias*” and “*huius matris familias*” with the second part remaining unchanged in all the case forms of the singular number. However, in the plural number, following a different pattern, we

¹ a craftsman, an artificer

² inept, insipid

³ omnipotent

⁴ inexpugnable, undaunted

⁵ sons of Atreus (Agamemnon and Menelaus), the son of Peleus (Achilles)

⁶ G. 2.170: “The Scipios, stubborn warriors”. Translated by Greenough 1900.

⁷ a grandson/ a spendthrift, the blade of a sword/ the eyesight/ a battle-formation

⁸ earth

⁹ a sword

¹⁰ *Aen.* 1.617/*Aen.* 9.647: “For the Dardanian Anchises” (translated by Williams 1910).

¹¹ worthy, worthless, nothing, nonsense

¹² willingly, a plague, a birth

¹³ a right, a crime

¹⁴ seas, wines, the country, air, honey

¹⁵ the Hellespont, a decree of the Senate, a decree of the people

¹⁶ a tribune of the people, a commander of the cavalry

¹⁷ the god of wine, Alba Longa, wine from Falernum

¹⁸ the head of the household, the mistress of a house

say “*horum patrum familiarum*”. The nouns *promilite*, *proconsule*, and *propraetore*,¹ although pronounced as one word, are similar in their form, because in the plural we say “*his propraetoribus*” and “*his proconsulibus*”.

There are six case patterns for inflecting nouns: the six-part, five-part, four-part, three-part, two-part, and the simple or united pattern. In the six-part pattern each of the six cases has a unique form, as in the paradigm of *unus*, *solus*, or *nullus*,² for we say “*hic unus*, *huius unius*, *huic uni*, *hunc unum*, *o une*, *ab hoc uno*”. In the five-part pattern the dative and the ablative case share a form, as in the paradigm of *doctus* or *probus*,³ for we say “*huic docto*” and “*ab hoc docto*”, with different forms for all the remaining cases. In the four-part pattern the nominative and the vocative case share a form, as in the paradigm of *res* or *spes*,⁴ as we say “*haec res*” and “*o res*” or “*haec spes*” and “*o spes*”. Also, the genitive and the dative case share a form, for instance *huius rei* and *huic rei*, *huius spei* and *huic spei*, with different forms for all the remaining cases. In the three-part pattern the nominative, the accusative, and the vocative case share a form, as in *scamnum* or *scrinium*,⁵ and likewise the dative and the ablative case share a form, as in *huic scamno* and *ab hoc scamno*. Similarly, the three-part pattern is found in common nouns ending in the letters *is*, where the nominative, the genitive, and the vocative case share a form, as in *facilis* or *agilis*,⁶ as do the dative and the ablative case, e.g., *huic facili* and *ab hoc facili*. The two-part pattern is found in neuter nouns ending in *u*, where the nominative, the accusative, and the vocative case share a form, for instance *genu* or *ueru*.⁷ The genitive, the dative, and the ablative case are set apart from the three other cases by a lengthening in the pronunciation, as we say “*huius genu*”, “*huic genu*”, and “*ab hoc genu*”. The simple or united pattern is found in monoptote nouns, like *frugi* and *nequam*,⁸ for we decline them thus: *hic frugi*, *huius frugi*, *huic frugi*, *hunc frugi*, *o frugi*, and *ab hoc frugi*. The plural declensions, on the other hand, have either a three-part or a four-part pattern. In the four-part pattern the nominative and the vocative case share a form, in a similar way as the dative and the ablative case, as can be seen in the paradigm of *docti* and *probi*.⁹ In the three-part declension the nominative, the accusative, and the vocative case share a similar form, and the dative and the ablative case also share a form, as in the paradigm of *scrinia* and *parietes*.¹⁰

The ablative singular can end in five different vowels, namely *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, with the exception of some pronouns, such as *ab eodem*, *a quodam*, or *ab hoc*,¹¹ as well as some common monoptote nouns, such as *nequam* or *nugas*.¹² Whenever the ablative singular ends in *a* or *o*, the genitive plural is formed by adding to it the syllable *rum*, as in *ab hac toga*, *harum togarum*, and *ab hoc libro*, *horum librorum*.¹³ The dative and the ablative case end in the syllable *is* in the plural number, as in *his togis*, *ab his togis*, and *his libris*, *ab his libris*. Two rules govern nouns which end in *e* in the

¹ in place of a soldier, a proconsul, a propraetor

² one, single, none

³ learned, honest

⁴ a thing, hope

⁵ a bench, a letter-case

⁶ easy, agile

⁷ a knee, a spit

⁸ worthy, worthless

⁹ learned (pl.), honest (pl.)

¹⁰ letter-cases, walls

¹¹ (by) the same, (by) someone, (by) this

¹² worthless, nonsense

¹³ a toga, a book

ablative singular. If the final *e* is short, the genitive plural is formed by dropping the final *e* and adding the syllable *um*, as in *ab hoc pariete, horum parietum*, and *ab hoc hospite, horum hospitum*.¹ If the final *e* is long, the genitive plural is formed by adding the syllable *rum* to the ablative, as in *ab hoc die, horum dierum*, and *ab hac re, harum rerum*.² In both these instances the dative and the ablative case end in the syllable *bus* in the plural number, as in *his parietibus, ab his parietibus, his diebus, ab his diebus*, and *his rebus, ab his rebus*. Nouns which end in the letter *i* in the ablative singular form the genitive plural by adding the syllable *um* to the ablative, as in *ab hoc agili, horum agilium*, and *ab hoc facili, horum facilitum*.³ The dative and ablative forms end in the syllable *bus*, as in *his agilibus, ab his agilibus*, and *his facilibus, ab his facilibus*. Also, in the accusative, these nouns should end in the syllable *is*, because they form a neuter accusative by changing the final *s* to an *a*, as in *haec facilia*. The nouns ending in the letter *u* in the ablative singular form the genitive plural by adding the syllable *um* to the ablative, as in *ab hoc fluctu, horum fluctuum*, and *ab hoc partu, horum partuum*.⁴ The dative and the ablative form end in the syllable *bus*, as in *his fluctibus, ab his fluctibus*, and *his partibus, ab his partibus*.

The accusative plural. We must say “*has puppis*”, “*has classis*”, and “*hos agilis*”⁵ in the accusative plural, because the nouns ending in *i* in the ablative singular form the genitive plural by adding the letters *um* to the ablative singular. The accusative plural of these nouns ends in the letters *is*, as in *ab hac puppi, harum puppium, has puppis*, and *ab hac turri, harum turrium, has turris*.⁶ However, the ancient writers frequently end the ablative singular of these nouns in the letter *e* rather than in the letter *i*, as in ‘*urbe Mycenae*’⁷ and express accusative plurals with the letters *es* instead of the letters *is*, as in ‘*centum urbes habitant magnas*’.⁸

Adverbs can be derived from all nouns ending in the letters *us*. These adverbs can end in a long *o*, as in *falsus falso*,⁹ or in a short *e*, as in *bonus bene*,¹⁰ *malus male*,¹¹ or in *im*, as in *raptus raptim*,¹² *caesus caesim*,¹³ or in *um*, as in *horrendus horrendum*,¹⁴ *magnus magnum*.¹⁵

VI The Pronoun (*De pronomine*)

The pronoun is a part of speech which, when used instead of the noun, signifies the same but less fully; for instance, when I should say “*artem Scaurus scripsit*”,¹⁶ I can say “*artem ille scripsit*”,¹⁷ and for “*artem Scaurus scripsisti*”,¹ I can say “*artem tu scripsisti*”.² The properties of

¹ a wall, a guest

² a day, a thing

³ agile, easy

⁴ a stream, a birth

⁵ sterns, fleets, agile (pl.)

⁶ a tower

⁷ *Aen.* 5.52: “(at the walls) of Mycene” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁸ *Aen.* 3.106: “It boasts a hundred cities” (translated by Williams 1910).

⁹ a liar, falsely

¹⁰ good, well

¹¹ bad, badly

¹² a plundering, hurriedly

¹³ a cutting, by cutting

¹⁴ horrible, horribly

¹⁵ great, greatly

¹⁶ “Scaurus wrote a grammar”

¹⁷ “he wrote a grammar”

the pronoun are the following: quality, gender, number, composition, person, and case.

There are two subcategories of quality: definite and indefinite. Definite pronouns denote a definite number and a definite person, as in *ego*, *tu*, and *ille*.³ Indefinite pronouns can be applied to any person, as in *quis*, *quantus*, and *qualis*.⁴

Also, pronouns are either prepositive, such as *quis*,⁵ or subjoined, such as *is*,⁶ or common, such as *talis* and *qualis*.⁷

Gender applies to pronouns in the same way as nouns, because pronouns are either masculine, like *quis*, or feminine, like *quae*, or neuter, like *quod*.⁸ There are also pronouns that are common to two genders, the feminine and neuter, such as *quae*,⁹ and pronouns that are common to all three genders, such as *ego*.¹⁰

Both numbers occur in pronouns, the singular number, *qualis*, and the plural number, *quales*.¹¹ There is also a common number, as in *qui* and *quae*, because we can say “*qui uir*” and “*qui uiri*”,¹² and “*quae mulier*” and “*quae mulieres*”.¹³

The composition of pronouns is twofold: there are simple pronouns, such as *quis* or *ego*,¹⁴ and compound pronouns, such as *quisquis* or *egomet*.¹⁵

Pronouns have three persons: the first person, like *ego* or *mihi*,¹⁶ the second person, like *tu* or *tibi*,¹⁷ and the third person, like *ille* or *sibi*.¹⁸

The same cases occur in pronouns as in nouns, for instance, in the declension of *hic*, *haec*, *hoc*,¹⁹ *huius*, *huic*, *hunc*, *hanc*, *hoc*, *o*, *ab hoc*, *ab hac*, and, in the plural number, *hi*, *hae*, *haec*, *horum*, *harum*, *his*, *hos*, *has*, *haec*, *o*, and *ab his*.

No pronoun undergoes comparison, even though it should signify a quality or a quantity and be used instead of a noun, like *pulcher* and *decens*²⁰ become *pulcherior* and *decentior*.²¹ A pronoun can signify a thing, as in *hoc* and *illud*,²² or a people, as in *cuius* and *nostras*,²³ or order, as in *quotus*

¹ “Scaurus, you wrote a grammar”

² “you wrote a grammar”

³ I, you, he

⁴ who?, how great?, what kind of?

⁵ who?

⁶ he/it

⁷ of what kind?, of such a kind

⁸ who? (m./ f./ n.)

⁹ which (f. nom. sing. + pl. & n. nom. pl./ n. acc. pl.)

¹⁰ I

¹¹ such (sing./pl.)

¹² which man, which men

¹³ which woman, which women

¹⁴ who?, I

¹⁵ whoever, I (emphasized form)

¹⁶ I, for me

¹⁷ you, for you

¹⁸ he, for himself

¹⁹ this (m./ f./ n.)

²⁰ beautiful, decent

²¹ more beautiful, more decent

²² this, that

²³ of what country?, of our country

and *totus*,¹ or a number, as in *quot* and *tot*,² or a quality, as in *qualis* and *talis*,³ or a quantity, as in *quantus* and *tantus*,⁴ or it can be relative to something, which is called *τὸν πρὸς τί* by the Greeks, who say this of those words that are in relation to something, like *meus* and *tuus*.⁵ †...† [...]

Pronouns are either singular in two senses, like *meus* or *tuus*,⁶ or plural in one sense, like *mei* or *tui*,⁷ or plural in two senses, like *nostri* or *uestri*.⁸

Some pronouns can be confused with adverbs, for instance, when we say “*qui potuit*”⁹ †...†

VII The Verb (*De uerbo*)

The verb is a part of speech with a tense and person but without a case. The verb has the following properties: quality, mood, number, composition, conjugation, person and tense.

The quality of verbs is either finite or infinite. Finite verbs denote a definite tense, a definite number and a definite person, e.g., *lego* and *scribo*.¹⁰ Infinite verbs do not signify anything definite, e.g., *legere* and *scribere*.¹¹ These verb forms are infinite in terms of their number, tense and person. *Legisse* and *scripsisse*¹² are also called infinite, but they are finite as regards their tense.

The verbal voice is divided into five subcategories: active, passive, neuter, common and deponent, which can also be called simple. Active verbs end in the letter *o*, and they can be transformed into the passive by adding the letter *r*, like *lego* or *scribo*, whose passive forms are *legor* and *scribor*.¹³ Passive verbs end in the letter *r*, and they can be transformed into the active by removing that letter, for instance, *lego* and *scribo*. Neuter verbs end in the letter *o*, and they never accept the letter *r*, for instance *nato*, *curro* or *cogito*.¹⁴ Common verbs end in the letter *r*, and they contain the meaning of both active and passive verbs, because we can say “*crimino te*” and “*crimino a te*”¹⁵ or “*consolo te*” and “*consolo a te*”.¹⁶ Simple verbs end in the letter *r*, which cannot be removed, for example *luctor* or *conuior*.¹⁷

These five subcategories of the verbal voice are conjugated in accordance with the seven moods which follow. There are seven moods of verbs in total; the indicative, imperative, promissive, optative, subjunctive, infinite and the impersonal mood: indicative, e.g., *lego*, imperative, e.g., *lege*,¹⁸ promissive, e.g., *legam*,¹ optative, e.g., *utinam legerem*,² subjunctive, e.g.,

¹ which (in number)?, so great a

² how many?, that many

³ of what kind?, of such a kind

⁴ of what size?, of such magnitude

⁵ my, your

⁶ my (sing.), your (sing.)

⁷ my (pl.), your (pl.)

⁸ our (pl.), your (pl.)

⁹ This can be translated as “who was able” or “by which means was (he) able”

¹⁰ I read, I write

¹¹ to read, to write

¹² to have read, to have written

¹³ I am being read, I am being described

¹⁴ I swim, I run, I think

¹⁵ I blame you, I am blamed by you

¹⁶ I console you and I am consoled by you

¹⁷ I struggle, I feast with

¹⁸ read!

cum legam or *si legam*,³ infinite, e.g., *legere*,⁴ and impersonal, e.g., *legitur*,⁵ which is similar to a passive. In addition to this, there are other types of impersonal mood, such as *sedetur*, *itur*, and *uidetur*.⁶ In addition, some also call such forms as *taedet*, *pudet*, and *paenitet*⁷ impersonal.

Verbs have two numbers, the singular and the plural number: singular, e.g., *scribo*, and plural, e.g., *scribimus*.⁸ There are verbs of common number as well, such as *legere* or *facere*,⁹ which are also common in terms of person. Furthermore, verbs can signify something that is done once, as in *lego*, or more often, as in *lecto*, or always, as in *lectito*.¹⁰

The composition of verbs is twofold; verbs are either simple, like *scribo*, or compound, like *describo*.¹¹ Compound verbs are formed in four ways, like nouns: from two full forms, from two corrupt forms, from a full form followed by a corrupt one or from a corrupt form followed by a full one.

Verbs have three persons: the first person, who produces the speech, e.g., *scribo*, the second person, to whom the speech is directed, e.g., *scribis*,¹² and the third person, whom the speech concerns, e.g., *scribit*.¹³

Verbs have three tenses, the present tense, the past tense and the future tense: the present tense, *lego*, the past tense, *legi*, and the future tense, *legam*.¹⁴ There are three subdivisions within the past tense: the perfect tense, *legi*,¹⁵ the imperfect tense with an inchoative form, *legebam*,¹⁶ and the pluperfect tense with a recollective form, *legeram*.¹⁷

We have three conjugations, which are called *συντάξεις* by the Greeks: the first, the second and the third conjugation. These conjugations can be recognized in active and neuter verbs. The verbs of the first conjugation end in the letters *as* in the second-person present-tense indicative, as in *amo* *amas* or *canto* *cantas*.¹⁸ The verbs of the second conjugation end in the letters *es* in the second-person present-tense indicative, as in *doceo* *doces* or *moneo* *mones*.¹⁹ The verbs of the third conjugation in the second-person present-tense indicative end in the letters *is*, which are sometimes pronounced short and sometimes long. The letters are pronounced short in verbs such as *lego* *legis* and *peto* *petis*,²⁰ and they are pronounced long in verbs such as *eo* *is* and *nutrio* *nutris*.²¹ This latter

¹ I will read

² I wish I would read

³ although I read, if I were to read

⁴ to read

⁵ it is read

⁶ it remains, it goes, it seems

⁷ it offends (me), (I) feel ashamed, it grieves (me)

⁸ I write, we write

⁹ to read, to do

¹⁰ I read, I read much, I read constantly

¹¹ I write, I describe

¹² you write (sing.)

¹³ he/she writes

¹⁴ I read, I have read, I will read

¹⁵ I read (imp.)/ I have read

¹⁶ I was reading

¹⁷ I had read

¹⁸ I love/ you love, I sing/ you sing

¹⁹ I teach/ you teach, I warn/ you warn

²⁰ I read/ you read, I demand/ you demand

²¹ I go/ you go, I nourish/ you nourish

type is, however, called the fourth conjugation by some grammarians, but others consider it, more competently, a part of the third conjugation.

Inchoative verbs. There are verbs which do not have a past-tense form, usually end in the letters *sco* and are called inchoative, such as *tepesco* and *feruesco*.¹ The past-tense forms *ferui* and *calui*² are derived from the forms *feruo* and *caleo*.³ Inchoative verb forms are derived from those verbs which end in the letter *o* in the indicative, like *horreo horresco*⁴ or *tepeo tepesco*.⁵ These verbs do not have a perfect tense, because they signify something that is begun but not completed.

Some of the verb forms which have given rise to inchoative verbs are in general use, for example, the verbs from which *tepesco*, *feruesco*, and *pallesco*⁶ are derived; as we can say: “*tepeo*”, “*tepeo*”, “*palleo*” or “*ferueo*”.⁷ On the other hand, we often use the inchoative verbs *albescio* and *iuvenesco*,⁸ whose primary forms are not in use. Virgil fashioned the verb form he used in ‘*campique ingentes ossibus alben*’.⁹ We do not use *iuveneo* or *seneo*, but long ago *seneo*¹⁰ was in use. Catullus derived from *seneo* the third person verb form *senet* which appears in his poem, ‘*nunc recondita senet quiete*’.¹¹

Defective verbs. There are verbs with a defective paradigm, which are therefore called defective verbs. These verbs usually end in the letter *i*, like *odi*, *noui*, *memini*, *coepi*, and *pepigi*,¹² or the letter *o*, like *soleo*, *fido*, *fio*, *meto*, *audeo*, and *gaudeo*.¹³

Verbs can be defective in three ways, in terms of their form, which may change within the inflectional paradigm, as in *refero refers refert*,¹⁴ *rettuli rettulisti rettulit*,¹⁵ *referebam* and *rettuleram*,¹⁶ as regards their voice, as in *fio factus sum* and *soleo solitus sum*,¹⁷ and in terms of their tense, as in *memini meministi meminit*,¹⁸ from which the forms *memineram memineras meminerat* are derived.¹⁹ These forms only occur in the indicative mood.

There exist verbs which share an identical form in the present tense but are separated in the perfect tense, like *pando*,²⁰ which becomes *pandi* and *pandaui*,²¹ and *sero*,²² which becomes *serui*

¹ I grow warm, I begin to boil

² I boiled, I was hot

³ I boil, I am hot

⁴ I am afraid, I grow fearful

⁵ I am warm, I grow warm

⁶ I grow warm, I begin to boil, I turn pale

⁷ I am warm, I am pale, I boil

⁸ I turn white, I grow young

⁹ *Aen.* 12.36: “The plains/ far round us glisten with their bleaching bones” (translated by Williams 1910).

¹⁰ I am old

¹¹ Catullus 4.2-26: “now she retired/ in quiet age” (translated by Burton 1894).

¹² I hate, I know, I remember, I begin, I fasten

¹³ I am accustomed to, I trust, I become, I reap, I dare, I rejoice

¹⁴ I bring back, you etc.

¹⁵ I have brought back, you etc.

¹⁶ I was bringing back, I had brought back

¹⁷ I become/ I became, I am accustomed to/ I was accustomed to

¹⁸ I remember, you etc.

¹⁹ I remembered, you etc.

²⁰ I open, I bend

²¹ I opened, I bent

²² I sow, I bind

and *seraui*.¹ And, vice versa, there are verbs which share the perfect-tense form but not the present-tense form, such as the verbs *lugeo* and *luceo*,² which both become *luxi*³ in the perfect, and *cerno* and *cresco*,⁴ which both become *creui*.⁵

VIII The Participle (*De participio*)

The participle is a part of speech which has no meaning of its own apart from that which it receives from the noun and verb. The participle is called thus, because it takes a part from both the noun and the verb: it receives a gender and a case from the noun, a voice and a tense from the verb, and number and composition from both.

All grammatical genders occur in participles, namely the masculine gender, e.g., *hoc factus*, the feminine gender, e.g., *haec facta*, and the neuter gender, e.g., *hoc factum*,⁶ all of which are subordinated to their own inflectional paradigms.

The voice⁷ of participles, like that of verbs, can be divided into five subcategories. Two types of participles can be derived from active verbs, namely the present and future participle: the present participle *legens* and the future participle *lecturus*.⁸ Two participles can be derived from passive verbs, namely the past participle and the future perfect participle: the past participle *lectus* and the future perfect participle *legendus*. Two participles can be derived from neuter verbs, namely the present and future participles: the present participle *uigilans* and the future participle *uigilaturus*.⁹ Four participles can be derived from common verbs, namely the present participle, the future participle, the past participle, and the future perfect participle: the present participle *criminans*, the future participle *criminaturus*, the past participle *criminatus*, and the future perfect participle *criminandus*.¹⁰ Three participles can be derived from deponent or simple verbs, namely the present participle, the future participle, and the past participle: the present participle *conuiuans*, the future participle *conuiuaturus*, and the past participle *conuiuatus*.¹¹

Although this is the case, usage can sometimes confuse the active and the neuter verbs with passive ones, like when we say “*potus sum*” or “*natandus est fluius*”,¹² and sometimes it transforms the passive into the active, as in *annus vertens* or *terra movens*.¹³

There are some participles that are identical to nouns, such as *cultus*¹⁴ and *uisus*,¹⁵ but participles are inflected *huius culti* and *huius uisi* in the genitive singular, whereas nouns are

¹ I sowed, I bound

² I grieve, I shine

³ I grieved, I shone

⁴ I discern, I grow

⁵ I discerned, I grew

⁶ past participles of the verb *facere* (to do)

⁷ The term *significatio* refers to voice in participles. In the chapter on the verb the term *genus* denotes voice; that term was, however, used to refer to grammatical gender in the discussion on the participle.

⁸ The participles *legens*, *lecturus*, *lectus* and *legendus* are all derived from the transitive verb *legere* (to read).

⁹ The participles *uigilans* and *uigilaturus* are derived from the verb *uigilare* (to stay awake).

¹⁰ The participles *criminans*, *criminaturus*, *criminatus* and *criminandus* are derived from the verb *criminari* (to accuse).

¹¹ The participles *conuiuans*, *conuiuaturus* and *conuiuatus* are derived from the verb *conuiuari* (to feast with).

¹² I have drunk, the river should be crossed by swimming. (cf. the discussion in chapter 3.9).

¹³ the passing year, the moving earth

¹⁴ cultivated/ culture

¹⁵ seen/ sight

inflected *huius cultus* and *huius uisus* in the genitive singular.

Participles have two numbers: singular, e.g., *hic currens*, and plural, e.g., *hi currentes*.¹ Also, participles can signify what is done once, like *legens* or *currens*,² or what is done more frequently, like *lectitans* or *cursitans*.³

The composition of participles is twofold: simple, as in *legens*, and compound, as in *perlegens*.⁴ Compound forms of participles, like compound nouns and verbs, are formed in four ways, as described above.

There are some participles which cannot be traced back to verbs, like *togatus*, *galeatus*, and *hastatus*.⁵ Varro and Laberius confirm that they are participles by saying the following: “They are like *armatus* and *aptatus*,⁶ which are derived from verbs”. However, as they have no corresponding verb, they should not be called participles.

XIII The Adverb (*De adverbio*)

The adverb is a part of speech which is added to the verb to clarify or change its meaning.

Adverbs either originate from themselves or are derived from other parts of speech. Adverbs which originate from themselves include, for instance, *heri* and *nuper*.⁷ Adverbs derived from other parts of speech include adverbs such as *docte* and *sapienter*,⁸ which have their origin in the nouns *doctus* and *sapiens*.⁹

The adverb has the following properties: meaning, comparison and composition. The subcategories of meaning in adverbs are numerous: some signify time, e.g., *hodie*, *cras*, *nunc*, *nuper*, *modo*, *antea*, and *perendie*,¹⁰ or place, e.g., *hic*, *illic*, *ubi* and *ibi*,¹¹ or number, e.g., *semel*, *bis*, *ter*, and *decies*,¹² or negation, e.g., *non*, *haud*, *nequaquam*, and *numquam*,¹³ or affirmation, e.g., *etiam*, *enimvero*, and *<quidni>*,¹⁴ or pointing out, e.g., *en*, *ecce*, and *eccillud*,¹⁵ or exhortation, e.g., *age*, *eia*, and *macte*,¹⁶ or wishing, e.g., *utinam* and *uelim*,¹⁷ or order, e.g., *deinde*, *deinceps*, and *inde*,¹⁸ or quality, e.g., *bene*, *male*, *frigide*, and *pessime*,¹⁹ or quantity, e.g., *plus*, *satis*, *nimum*,

¹ this running (man)/ these running (men)

² reading, running

³ reading often, running about

⁴ reading, reading through

⁵ clad in a toga, helmed, armed with a spear

⁶ armed, fitted

⁷ yesterday, recently

⁸ learnedly, wisely

⁹ learned, wise

¹⁰ today, tomorrow, now, recently, just now, previously, the day after tomorrow

¹¹ here, there, where, in that place

¹² once, twice, thrice, ten times

¹³ no, not, not at all, never

¹⁴ actually, in fact, of course

¹⁵ see!, behold!, there it is!

¹⁶ come!, quick!, well done!

¹⁷ if only, I should like

¹⁸ next, after that, thence

¹⁹ well, wrongfully, coldly, most wrongfully

parum, *abunde*, *large*, *plene*, *uaste*,¹ or interrogation, e.g., *cur*, *quid ita*, [...] *quidnam*, and *quare*,² or likeness, e.g., *ceu*, *quasi*, *ueluti*, and *sicuti*,³ or uncertainty, e.g., *fortasse* and *forsitan*,⁴ or person, e.g., *mecum*, *tecum*, *nobiscum*, *uobiscum*, *quicum*, and *equidem*,⁵ or uniting, e.g., *simul*, *pariter*, and *una*,⁶ or calling out, e.g., *heus*, or answering, e.g., *heu*, or prohibition, e.g., *ne*,⁷ or separation, e.g., *seorsum*,⁸ or confirmation, e.g., *etiam*, *uero*, and *plane*,⁹ or swearing, e.g., *edepol*, *mehercule*, and *medius fidius*,¹⁰ †...† or comparison, e.g., *magis* and *potius*,¹¹ or occurrence, e.g., *forte*,¹² †...† or limit, e.g., *hactenus* and *dumtaxat*.¹³

Some adverbs are rightly called decorative. When they are added to a sentence, they adorn it, but, if removed, they take nothing away from its meaning, for instance, *profecto*, *tandem*, *dum*, *locorum*, *gentium*, *terrarum*,¹⁴ as in †...† <...>

Adverbs denoting place have either a definite meaning, as in *hic*, *illic*, *ibi*, and *ubi*,¹⁵ or an indefinite one, as in *supra*, *ultra*, and *citra*.¹⁶ Adverbs denoting time are either definite, as in *heri* or *hodie*,¹⁷ or indefinite, as in *frequenter* or *cottidie*.¹⁸

Adverbs undergo comparison when the nouns from which they are derived do so, for instance, *docte doctius doctissime*,¹⁹ which is derived from *doctus doctior doctissimus*.

The composition of adverbs is, as is the case with all parts of speech, either simple, e.g., *iuste*, or compound, e.g., *iniuste*.²⁰

Prepositions must not be added separately to adverbs.

XIV The Preposition²¹ (*De praepositione*)

The preposition is a part of speech which is placed before another part of speech to complete or change its meaning, e.g., *scribo*, *subscribo*, and *describo*.²²

Prepositions occur with nouns or verbs. Some only occur with nouns, like *apud* or *penes*, as in

¹ more, enough, too much, little, in abundance, copiously, generously, prodigiously

² why?, how so?, why, pray?, for what reason?

³ like, as good as, just like, just as

⁴ possibly, perhaps

⁵ together with me, together with you, / together with us/ together with you (pl.)/ together with that who, for my part

⁶ together, as much, at the same time

⁷ not

⁸ separately

⁹ certainly, in truth, quite

¹⁰ by Pollux!, by Hercules!, so help me God!

¹¹ more, rather

¹² by chance

¹³ so far, no more than

¹⁴ indeed, then, a moment, (till) then, (where) on earth, (where) in the world

¹⁵ here, in that place, there, where

¹⁶ above, beyond, near

¹⁷ yesterday, today

¹⁸ frequently, daily

¹⁹ learnedly, more learnedly, most learnedly

²⁰ justly, unjustly

²¹ The word class *praepositio* contained both prepositions and prefixes in Late Latin grammars.

²² I write, I write down, I describe

apud deos and *penes homines*.¹ Some only occur with verbs, like *am-*, *con-*, *re-*, *se-*, *di-*, and *dis-*,² as in *ambio*, *concedo*, *refero*, *secedo*, *dilato*, and *dissentio*.³ The remaining prepositions occur with both verbs and nouns, as, for example, *perfer* and *per hunc*⁴ or *admoue* and *ad urbem*.⁵

Some of the prepositions occurring with nouns take the accusative case, while some take the ablative case, and some can take both cases.

The following prepositions take the accusative case: *per*, *apud*, *aduersus*, *uls*, *ad*, *usque*, *pone*, *supra*, *contra*, <*cis*>, *citra*, *ultra*, *subtus*, *prope*, *iuxta*, *circum*, *ob*, *ante*, *secundum*, *praeter*, *propter*, *infra*, *intra*, *circa*, *extra*, *post*, *inter*, *erga*, *secus*, *clam*, *trans* <*penes*>; e.g., *per hominem*, *apud grammaticum*, *aduersus leges*, *uls prouinciam*, *ad amicum*,⁶ *usque Romam*, *pone fores*, *supra legem*, *contra ius*, *cis Galliam*,⁷ *citra sedem*, *ultra familias*, *subtus iugum*, *prope finem*, *iuxta montem*,⁸ *circum portum*, *ob iniuriam*, *ante aedes*, *secundum mare*, [...] *praeter spem*,⁹ *propter aquam*, *infra annum*, *intra locum*, *circa rationem*, *extra hostem*, *post annum*,¹⁰ *inter domos*, *erga rem* <*publicam*>, *secus portum*, *clam uxorem*, *trans montem*, *penes amicum*.¹¹ The following prepositions take the ablative case: *a*, *ab*, *abs*, <*absque*>, *de*, *e*, *ex*, *pro*, *prae*, *cum*, *sine*, *tenus*, *coram*, *palam*: e.g., *a solo*, *ab urbe*, <***> *absque pudore*, *de domo*, *e portu*,¹² *ex ordine*, *pro iure*, *prae uirtute*, *cum socio*,¹³ *sine fide*, *tenus crure*, *coram patre*, *palam filio*.¹⁴

The prepositions *in*, *sub*, and *subter* can take either the accusative or the ablative case. When we wish to express that something remains in a certain place, we use the ablative case. When we wish to express that something goes to a certain place, we use the accusative case, as in *in foro sum* and *in forum eo*¹⁵ or *sub tecto sum* and *sub tectum fugio*¹⁶ or *subter aqua sum* and *subter aquam uenio*.¹⁷

If the preposition *super* refers to a place, we must combine it with the accusative, as in ‘*at Lausum socii exanimem super arma*’,¹⁸ that is *super arma* for *supra arma*.¹⁹ However, if we use the preposition *super* instead of the preposition *de*, an ablative must be used instead, as in ‘*multa super*

¹ before gods, with people

² Note that *di-* and *dis-* are actually the one and the same prefix (OLD: s.v. *dis-*): “FORMS: unchanged before initial *c p t s*; *di-* before *b d g l m n r* (but *disrumpo*, *dirumpo* as well as *dirumpo*) consonantal *u* and sometimes *i* (*diudico*, *diungo*, but also *disiungo*, *disicio*, *disiectus*); *dif-* (by assimilation) before *f*; *dir-* (by rhotacism) before vowels and *h* (*diribeo*, but contrast *dishiasco* and perh. *disamo*).”

³ I go round, I concede, I bring back, I withdraw, I extend, I dissent

⁴ carry out!, through him

⁵ bring up!, to the city

⁶ through that person, at the grammarian’s, contrary to the laws, on the far side of the province, to a friend

⁷ as far as Rome, behind the doors, above the law, against the law, on this side of Gaul

⁸ within the dwelling-place, beyond the estates, under the yoke, close to the boundary, next to the mountain

⁹ in the vicinity of the harbour, because of an injustice, in front of the house, beside the sea, beyond hope

¹⁰ close to the water, within a year, inside the place, with regard to reason, free from the enemy, after a year

¹¹ between the houses, with regard to the state, beside the harbour, unknown to the wife, on the other side of the mountain, with a friend

¹² from the ground, from the city, without shame, away from home, out of the harbour

¹³ in order, on the side of the law, because of virtue, with an ally

¹⁴ without trust, up to the shin, in the presence of the father, before the son

¹⁵ I am in the forum, I go to the forum

¹⁶ I am under a roof, I flee under a roof

¹⁷ I am under the water, I end up under the water

¹⁸ *Aen.* 10.841: “But lo! his peers bore the dead Lausus back upon his shield” (translated by Williams 1910).

¹⁹ on top of his shield

Priamo rogicans, super Hectore multa’,¹ that is *super Priamo* for *de Priamo* and *de Hectore*.²

When the preposition *in* is placed before another part of speech, it can have two opposite meanings. It can either intensify the meaning of the unaugmented word, as in the words *inponens* or *instans*,³ or lessen it, as in the words *inmitis* or *infelix*.⁴

The prepositions *in-* and *con-* are pronounced long, when followed by the letters *s* or *f*, as in the word *infelix*,⁵ and they are pronounced short, when followed by any other letters.

XV The Conjunction (*De coniunctione*)

The conjunction is a part of speech which connects a complete meaning and creates order. The conjunction has the following properties: meaning, composition and order.

Meaning in conjunctions is divided into five subcategories, as there exist copulative, disjunctive, expletive, causal and rational conjunctions: copulative conjunctions, e.g., *et*, *at*, *atque*, *que*, [...] *ast*, *ac*,⁶ disjunctive conjunctions, e.g., *aut*, *ue*, *uel*, *ne*, *nec*, *neque*,⁷ expletive conjunctions, e.g., *quidem*, *equidem*, *quoque*, *autem*, *tamen*, *porro*,⁸ causal conjunctions, e.g., *si*, *etsi*, *etiam*, *etiamsi*, †† *sitamen*, *siquidem*, *quando*, *quandoquidem*, *quin*, *quinetiam*, *sinetiam*, *siue*, *seu*, *sin*, *nam*, *namque*, *nisi*, *nisisi*, *enim*, *etenim*, *sed*, *praeterea*, *quamobrem*, *praesertim*, *quamquam*, *quamuis*, *proinde*, *saltem*, *uidelicet*, *item*, *itemque*, *ceterum*, *alioquin*, *propterea*, *sane*,⁹ and rational conjunctions, e.g., *ergo*, *igitur*, *ita*, *itaque*, *enim*, *enimvero*, *quia*, *quapropter*, *quippe*, *quoniam*, *quoniamquidem*, *ideo*, *idcirco*, *scilicet*, *quatenus*.¹⁰

Composition in prepositions indicates whether conjunctions are simple or compound, simple, like *quoniam*, *quidem*, and *quando*,¹¹ or compound, like *quoniam quidem*, *equidem*, and *quandoquidem*.¹²

Order in prepositions indicates which conjunctions occur at the beginning of the sentence, like *nam* and *equidem*,¹³ [...] and which occur later in the sentence, like *enim*, *-que*, and *autem*,¹⁴ and which can do both, like *et* or *<igitur>*.¹⁵

There are some conjunctions, which, like some prepositions, can be confused with adverbs, for example *quando*, *enim*, *ante*, and *post*.¹⁶

¹ *Aen.* 1.750: “Now many a tale of Priam would she crave, of Hector many” (translated by Williams 1910).

² about Priam, about Hector

³ imposing, urgent

⁴ merciless, unhappy

⁵ unhappy

⁶ and, but, and indeed, etc.

⁷ or, or else, etc.

⁸ indeed, of course, too, however, etc.

⁹ if, although, besides, even if, etc.

¹⁰ therefore, accordingly, thus, for that reason, etc.

¹¹ since, indeed, because

¹² since at any rate, of course, seeing that

¹³ for, of course

¹⁴ namely, and, while

¹⁵ and, therefore

¹⁶ when, namely, before, after

XVI The Interjection (*De interiectione*)

The interjection is a part of speech signifying the passion of the soul.

We are moved by various passions; for instance, we express our joy with the interjection *ua*,¹ our grief with *heu*,² our praise with *euax*³ or our astonishment with *papae*.⁴ We can attract someone's attention with the interjection *heus*,⁵ express our observation of something with *attat*,⁶ or we can express our amusement with *bonbax*.⁷

In the writings of Plautus there are also other parts of speech used as interjections. Also Virgil, for instance, wrote thus: '*sequiturque, nefas, Aegyptia coniux*'⁸ (*nefas* should be understood as an interjection here) and also '*pecudesque locutae, infandum*'.⁹ This occurs also when we say things like "*pro dolor*" or "*pro pudor*".¹⁰

¹ ooh!

² alas!

³ hurrah!

⁴ wow!

⁵ hey there!

⁶ ah!

⁷ splendid!

⁸ *Aen.* 8.688: "and last—O shameless!—his Egyptian spouse" (translated by Williams 1910).

⁹ *G.* 1.478-9: "And cattle spake, portentous!" (translated by Greenough 1900).

¹⁰ for grief!, for shame!